

Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

Brill's Companions in Classical Studies

ISSN 1872-3357

Also in this series:

Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Pastoral, edited by Marco Fantuzzi and Theodore Papanghelis. ISBN 978 90 04 14795 9

Brill's Companion to Propertius, edited by Hans-Christian Günther.
ISBN 978 90 04 13682 3

Brill's Companion to Thucydides, edited by Antonios Rengakos and Antonis Tsakmakis.
ISBN 978 90 04 13683 0

See also <http://www.brill.nl/bccs>

Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram

Down to Philip

Edited by

Peter Bing and Jon Steffen Bruss



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON

2007

Cover illustration: Les Bergers d'Arcadie (Paris, musée du Louvre) by Nicolas Poussin, 1650-5. One shepherd traces with his finger the monument's inscription, *ET IN ARCADIA EGO*. As an image of the act of reading an inscription, the painting reprises, centuries later, the Hellenistic poets' reflection upon their inscribed models in literary epigram. (C) Photo RMN/© René-Gabriel Ojéda.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication data

A C.I.P. record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISSN 1872-3357

ISBN 978 90 04 15218 2

© Copyright 2007 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing,
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι

(*Iliad* 11.76)

CONTENTS

Preface	xi
List of Contributors	xiii
Abbreviations	xix

1. Introduction to the Study of Hellenistic Epigram	1
<i>Peter Bing and Jon Steffen Bruss</i>	

PART ONE MODELS AND FORM

2. Poems on Stone: The Inscribed Antecedents of Hellenistic Epigram	29
<i>Joseph W. Day</i>	
3. Inscribed Epigram in Pre-Hellenistic Literary Sources	49
<i>Andrej Petrovic</i>	
4. The Mutual Influence of Inscribed and Literary Epigram	69
<i>Anja Bettenworth</i>	
5. From Archaic Elegy to Hellenistic Symptotic Epigram?	95
<i>Ewen Bowie</i>	
6. <i>Sylloge Simonidea</i>	113
<i>David Sider</i>	
7. The Arrangement of Epigrams in Collections	131
<i>Nita Krevans</i>	
8. Meleager and Philip as Epigram Collectors	147
<i>Lorenzo Argentieri</i>	
9. Meter and Diction: From Refinement to Mannerism	165
<i>Enrico Magnelli</i>	

PART TWO POETICS

10. The Act of Reading and the Act of Writing in Hellenistic Epigram	187
<i>Doris Meyer</i>	

11. Gendered Voices in Hellenistic Epigram	211
<i>Jackie Murray and Jonathan M. Rowland</i>	
12. Characterization in Hellenistic Epigram	233
<i>Graham Zanker</i>	
13. Epigrams on Art: Voice and Voicelessness in Hellenistic Epigram	251
<i>Irmgard Münnlein-Robert</i>	

PART THREE GENRE

14. Tell, All Ye Singers, My Fame: Kings, Queens and Nobility in Epigram	275
<i>Annemarie Ambühl</i>	
15. Epinician Epigram	295
<i>Adolf Köhnken</i>	
16. The Paradox of Amatory Epigram	313
<i>Kathryn J. Gutzwiller</i>	
17. Bucolic Epigram	333
<i>Karl-Heinz Stanzel</i>	
18. Satiric Epigram	353
<i>Gideon Nisbet</i>	

PART FOUR EPIGRAMS AND THEIR INTERTEXTS

19. One Things Leads (Back) to Another: Allusion and the Invention of Tradition in Hellenistic Epigrams	373
<i>Alexander Sens</i>	
20. Glossing Homer: Homeric Exegesis in Early Third Century Epigram	391
<i>Evina Sistakou</i>	
21. Epigram and the Heritage of Epic	409
<i>Annette Harder</i>	
22. Inscribing Lyric	429
<i>Benjamin Acosta-Hughes and Silvia Barbantani</i>	
23. The Hellenistic Epigrams on Archilochus and Hipponax	459
<i>Ralph Rosen</i>	

24. Epigram and the Theater	477
<i>Marco Fantuzzi</i>	
25. Philosophers and Philosophy in Greek Epigram	497
<i>Dee L. Clayman</i>	

PART FIVE RECEPTION

26. Hellenistic Epigram in the Roman World: From the Beginnings to the End of the Republican Age	521
<i>Alfredo M. Morelli</i>	
27. Roman Imperial Receptions of Hellenistic Epigram	543
<i>Gideon Nisbet</i>	
28. The Modern Reception of Greek Epigram	565
<i>Kenneth Haynes</i>	
Bibliography	585
Indexes	
Index of Epigrams Discussed	623
Index of Ancient Passages Discussed	631
General Subject Index	638

PREFACE

“You are just deluging me with epigrams” (εὐθὺ κατακλύζεις ἐπιγράμμασιν), protests the speaker of Lucillius’ epigram, *AP* 11.137.3, and so might a wary reader into whose unsuspecting hands this volume happened to come. Yet a whole raft of important studies over the past couple of decades—given added push by the publication of P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309 (“the Milan Posidippus papyrus”) in 2001—has reinvigorated the study of Hellenistic epigram and brought it to a new stage. A Brill’s Companion for this subject is thus particularly timely, and we have consequently conceived of it as a book that might speak with some breadth, depth, concentration, and provocation on this ancient poetic genre. The audience we envision consists not only of experts in the field of Hellenistic literature, but of educated neophytes—advanced classics undergraduates and graduate students, classics scholars whose fields touch but tangentially upon the Hellenistic period and its poetry, and those in altogether different fields whose research and reading takes them to the Hellenistic era.

In the preface to their 1965 edition and commentary, *Hellenistic Epigrams*, A.S.F. Gow and D.L. Page speak, rightly, of the labyrinthine nature of the Byzantine-era *Greek Anthology*, the source from which most Greek epigrams are drawn. Despite growing academic interest in Hellenistic literature since their time, epigram remains an area in which readers may well long for an Ariadne’s thread to guide them through the primary and secondary materials. We offer this Companion in the hope that it will help them make the most of their explorations. The arrangement of this book into parts and chapters seeks to identify general fields in the study of and approaches to epigram; the bibliography here assembled draws together the most relevant, significant, and up-to-date work of epigram scholarship. In addition, we asked all contributors not only to show the *status quaestionis* on their assigned topic, and themselves to enter the fray on the matter, but also to point in directions where new pathways might be discovered in the labyrinth of Hellenistic epigram. This our authors have done to a remarkable degree, making each individual contribution more than an ephemeral glimpse at how things stand in 2006. Their essays, moreover, fruitfully interact, so that new paths in epigram scholarship are derivable here

not only from explicit and suggestive statements by the contributors, but also from the collocation of ideas and topics within the volume.

Many people have helped us from the genesis of this project to its completion. We wish to thank Nita Krevans and Kathryn Gutzwiller for their early encouragement. Our contributors, too, deserve heartfelt thanks. Their evident delight in the scholarly give-and-take necessary to produce a collection such as ours made our work a real pleasure. On the editorial side, Michiel Swormink and Irene van Rossum, the classics editors at Brill, were warmly supportive from the first. The volume also benefited from Peter's one-year tenure as Barrington Fellow in the Margo Tytus Visiting Fellowship Program of the University of Cincinnati during 05–06. Ben Bayer, Emory University ('06) offered his computing expertise in helping prepare the bibliography; and Nelson Berry at the University of the South, his good labor in producing the typescript.

Our department colleagues have graciously overlooked the human faults that become more evident under the pressing and harried business of producing such a volume. Not least, our families—Kristine and Ingrid in Jon's case, Mary and Anna in Peter's, who opened their homes for working visits from us both—lent us their moral support, expertise in related areas, patience with our impatience, and the existential space to leave this project behind when needed. In all these respects they have been very much a part of this volume.

J.S.B et P.B., Sevaniae et Atlantae, a. D. MMVI

CONTRIBUTORS

BENJAMIN ACOSTA-HUGHES is Associate Professor of Greek and Latin at the University of Michigan. His numerous publications include *Polyeideia—The Iambi of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition* and *Callimachus, Hipponax and the Persona of the Iambographer*.

ANNEMARIE AMBÜHL works currently as guest researcher and lecturer at the Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, Netherlands. Her Ph.D. thesis from the University of Basel, *Kinder und junge Helden: Innovative Aspekte des Umgangs mit der literarischen Tradition bei Kallimachos*, appeared in 2005.

LORENZO ARGENTIERI teaches high school in Rome; his main field of research is Hellenistic poetry. His published work includes *Gli epigrammi degli Antipatri* (Bari 2003), which explores the attribution of epigrams to Antipater of Sidon and Thessalonica.

SILVIA BARBANTANI is a Researcher at the Università Cattolica, Milano, associate member of the Classics Center, Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and author of several contributions on Hellenistic literature, including ΦΑΤΙΣ ΝΙΚΗΦΟΡΟΣ. *Frammenti di elegia encomiastica nell'età delle Guerre Galatiche* (Milan 2001).

ANJA BETTENWORTH, recently a Feodor Lynen Fellow at the University of Michigan, is now *wissenschaftliche Assistentin* for Latin at the Universität Münster. Co-author of a volume on film's reception of antiquity, her next book is about inscriptions and memory in Roman elegy.

PETER BING, Professor of Classics at Emory University, is author of dozens of articles on Hellenistic poetry, primarily epigram. A collection of his articles, *The Marble and the Scroll: Studies in Reading and Reception in Hellenistic Poetry* appears in 2007.

EWEN BOWIE is Professor of Classical Languages and Literature at Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Author of scores of articles on Greek prose

and poetry ranging from the archaic period to the Roman empire, he is currently completing a commentary on Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*.

JON STEFFEN BRUSS, author of several articles on Hellenistic poetry and of a monograph on Hellenistic sepulchral epigram, *Hidden Presences* (Leuven 2005), is Assistant Professor of Classical Languages at the University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee.

DEE L. CLAYMAN is Professor of Classics at City University of New York and serves as Director of the Database of Classical Bibliography. The author of *Callimachus' Iambi* (Leiden 1980), she has also written articles on Greek poetry and quantitative stylistics.

JOSEPH DAY is Professor of Classics at Wabash College. He has written articles on archaic inscribed epigrams (e.g., "Rituals in Stone," *JHS* 1989, "Interactive Offerings," *HSCP* 1994), and his monograph on dedications with metrical inscriptions is nearing completion.

MARCO FANTUZZI is Professor of Ancient Greek Literature at the University of Macerata and the University of Florence. Co-author with Richard Hunter of *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge 2004) he is presently writing a commentary on the *Rhesus*, ascribed to Euripides.

KATHRYN GUTZWILLER, Professor of Classics at the University of Cincinnati, is author of *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context* (1998) and editor of *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book* (2005). She will publish *Blackwell Guide to Hellenistic Literature* in 2006.

ANNETTE HARDER is Chair of Ancient Greek Language and Literature at the University of Groningen, The Netherlands. The editor of the series *Hellenistica Groningana*, she has authored a number of articles on Hellenistic poetry, particularly Callimachus; her commentary on the *Aetia* will appear soon.

KENNETH HAYNES teaches in the Department of Comparative Literature at Brown University. His recent publications include *English Literature and Ancient Languages* (2003) and the *Oxford History of Literary Translation in English: Vol. 4, 1790–1900* (2006), co-edited with Peter France.

ADOLF F. KÖHNKEN, co-editor of *Hermes* and de Gruyter's *Texte und Kommentare* series, has recently issued *Darstellungsziele und Erzählstrategien in antiken Texten* (2006), a collection of his articles. He is Professor emeritus of Classics at the Westfälische Wilhelms Universität Münster.

NITA KREVANS is Associate Professor of Classical and Near Eastern Studies at the University of Minnesota. Her recent work includes essays on Callimachus, Apollonius, Virgil, and Posidippus, and (with Alex Sens) "Language and Literature" in the *Cambridge Companion to the Hellenistic World*.

ENRICO MAGNELLI, formerly Research Fellow at the University of Florence, now teaches at the Liceo "Machiavelli" of Florence. Among his several pieces on Hellenistic poetry and Greek meter are included *Alexandri Aetoli testimonia et fragmenta* (1999) and *Studi su Euforione* (2002).

IRMGARD MÄNNLEIN-ROBERT, Professor of Greek Philology at the University of Tübingen, works on Platonic literature (*Longin: Philologe und Philosoph*, 2001) and Hellenistic poetry. Her 2005 hab., *Stimme, Schrift und Bild: Zum Verhältnis der Künste in der hellenistischen Dichtung*, appears in 2007.

DORIS MEYER is *ingénieur de recherche* in the research group "UMR 7044" of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) and the University "Marc Bloch" of Strasbourg (France). Her *Inszeniertes Lesevergnügen: Das inschriftliche Epigramm und seine Rezeption bei Kallimachos* appeared in 2005.

ALFREDO MARIO MORELLI is *professore associato* in Latin language and literature at the University of Cassino. Among various publications on Greco-Roman poetry, he also wrote a book on early Latin epigram, *L'epigramma latino prima di Catullo* (Cassino 2000).

JACKIE MURRAY is Assistant Professor of Classics at Temple University. Her recent publications are "Constructions of the Argo in Apollonius' *Argonautica*" in *Beginning from Apollo* (Leuven 2005) and "The Metamorphoses of Erysichthon: Callimachus, Apollonius and Ovid" in *Callimachus II* (Leuven 2004).

GIDEON NISBET, Lecturer in Classics at the University of Glasgow, has authored several articles on epigram along with two books, *Greek Epigram in the Roman Empire: Martial's Forgotten Rivals* (Oxford 2003) and *Ancient Greece in Film and Popular Culture* (Exeter 2006).

ANDREJ PETROVIC (Ph.D., Heidelberg University) is a Lecturer in Greek History at Durham University. He has written on various aspects of Greek culture, history and epigraphy.

RALPH M. ROSEN is Rose Family Endowed Term Professor and Professor of Classical Studies at the University of Pennsylvania. He has published widely on Greek and Latin literature, especially comic and satirical poetry. His most recent book, *Making Mockery: the Poetics of Ancient Satire*, appears in 2007 with Oxford University Press.

JONATHAN M. ROWLAND received his B.A. at the University of Washington and is currently studying for his M.Phil. degree at the University of Cambridge.

ALEXANDER SENS is Professor of Classics at Georgetown University, author of a critical edition of Theocritus 22, and co-author of editions of Archestratus and Matro. He is currently finishing an edition of Asclepiades of Samos.

DAVID SIDER is Professor of Classics at New York University. His recent publications include work on the epigrams of Philodemus and Posidippus, and a collection of essays, *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire* (Oxford 2001), which he co-edited with Deborah Boedeker.

EVINA SISTAKOU is Assistant Professor of Greek Literature at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. Her publications include two monographs, on the reception of the Trojan myth in Hellenistic poetry (Athens 2004) and on the use of geography in the poetry of Callimachus (Athens 2005).

KARL-HEINZ STANZEL, author of over a dozen articles, has also published *Liebende Hirten: Theokrits Bukolik und die alexandrinische Poesie* (Leipzig 1995). He is Privat-Dozent of Greek at the Universität Tübingen.

GRAHAM ZANKER is the Professor of Classics at the University of Canterbury, New Zealand. His writings on Greek epic, Hellenistic poetry and ancient literary criticism are well known, and include his recent book *Modes of Viewing in Hellenistic Poetry* (2004).

FREQUENTLY USED ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Austin, C., et Bastianini, G. eds. <i>Posidippi quae supersunt omnia</i> . Milano, 2002.
AP	<i>Anthologia Palatina</i>
APl	<i>Anthologia Planudea</i>
Athen.	Athenaeus, <i>Deipnosophistae</i>
CEG	<i>Carmina epigraphica graeca</i> , ed. P.A. Hansen. 2 vols. Berlin and New York, 1983–9.
CIG	<i>Corpus inscriptionum graecarum</i> (1828–77).
CIL	<i>Corpus inscriptionum latinarum</i> .
CLE	<i>Carmina latina epigraphica</i> . ed. F. Büchler. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1897.
Courtney	Courtney, E., ed. <i>The Fragmentary Latin Poets</i> . Oxford, 1993.
D.L.	Diogenes Laertius
Dg	Degani, E. <i>Hipponax. Testimonia et Fragmenta</i> . 2nd ed. Stuttgart, 1991.
Diels	Diels, H., ed. <i>Poetarum Philosophicorum Fragmenta</i> . Berlin, 1901.
D-K	Diels, H., and Kranz, W., eds. <i>Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker</i> . 8th ed. Hamburg, 1957.
Ep./Epp.	Epigram/Epigrams
FGE	<i>Further Greek Epigrams</i> . ed. D.L. Page. Cambridge, 1981.
FGrH	<i>Fragmenta der griechischen Historiker</i> . ed. F. Jacoby. Berlin/Leiden, 1923–.
FPL	<i>Fragmenta poetarum latinorum</i> . ed. W. Morel.
fr./fr.	fragment/fragments
GA	<i>Greek Anthology/Anthologia Graeca</i>
Galán Vioque	Galán Vioque, G., ed. <i>Dioscorides. Epigramas</i> . Huelva, 2001.
GG	<i>Griechische Grabgedichte</i> , ed. W. Peek. Berlin, 1960.

GP*	Gow, A.S.F., and Page, D.L. <i>The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams</i> . Cambridge, 1965.
GP <i>Garland</i>	Gow, A.S.F., and Page, D.L. <i>The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip</i> . Cambridge, 1968.
Guichard	Guichard, L.A., ed. <i>Asclepiades de Samos, epigramas y fragmentos</i> . Bern, 2004.
GVI	<i>Griechische Vers-Inschriften</i> , I: <i>Grab-epigramme</i> . ed. W. Peek, Berlin, 1955.
H.	Hollis, A., ed. <i>Callimachus: Hecale</i> . Oxford, 1990.
Hense	Wachsmuth, C., and Hense, O., eds. <i>Joannis Stobaei Anthologium</i> . Berlin, 1884.
IG	<i>Inscriptiones graecae</i>
K.-A.	Kassel, R., and Austin, C., eds. <i>Poetae comici graeci</i> . 8 vols. Berlin, 1983–.
Kaibel	Kaibel, G., ed. <i>Epigrammata Graeca</i> . Berlin, 1878.
LGPN	<i>A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names</i> . eds. P.M. Fraser and E. Matthews, 4 vols. Oxford, 1987–2005.
LP	Lobel, E., and Page, D.L., eds. <i>Poetarum Lesbiorum fragmenta</i> . Oxford, 1955.
Marx	Marx, F., ed. <i>G. Lucilii carminum reliquiae</i> . 2 vols. Leipzig, 1904–5.
Massimilla	Massimilla, G., ed. <i>Aetia, libri primo e secundo. Callimaco</i> . Pisa, 1996.
Morel	Morel, W., ed. <i>Fragmenta poetarum Latinorum epicorum et lyricorum prater Ennium et Lucilium</i> . Leipzig 1927 [repr. Stuttgart, 1975].
MP	Mertens-Pack
ms./mss.	manuscript/manuscripts
OCD	<i>The Oxford Classical Dictionary</i> . eds. S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth. Oxford, 2003.
P.	papyrus
Page	Page, D.L., ed. <i>The Epigrams of Rufinus</i> . Cambridge, 1978.
Pf.	Pfeiffer, R., ed. 1949–53. <i>Callimachus</i> . 2 vols. Oxford, 1949–53.

* When citing Gow and Page's commentaries or textual apparatuses, we use the following form: (a) Gow-Page (date: vol.page number). Examples: Gow-Page (1965: 2.125); Gow-Page (1968: 1.75).

PMG	<i>Poetae melici graeci</i> . ed. D.L. Page. Oxford, 1962.
Powell	Powell, J.U., ed. <i>Collectanea alexandrina</i> . Oxford, 1925.
R. ³	Ribbeck, O., ed. <i>Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta</i> . Leipzig, 1897–8.
S.E.	Sextus Empiricus
SEG	<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i> .
SGO	<i>Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten</i> . eds. R. Merkelbach and J. Stauber. Stuttgart, 1998–2004.
SH	<i>Supplementum Hellenisticum</i> . eds. H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons. Berlin, 1983.
SHA	<i>Scriptores historiae Augustae</i> . eds. E. Hohl, C. Samberger, and W. Seyfarth. 2 vols. 5th ed. Stuttgart, 1997.
Shackleton Bailey	Shackleton Bailey, D.R., ed. <i>M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistulae ad familiares, libri I–XVI</i> . Stuttgart, 1988.
Sider	Sider, D. 1996. <i>The Epigrams of Philodemos</i> . Oxford, 1996.
SIG	<i>Sylloge inscriptionum Graecarum</i> (1915–24).
Sn	Hervicus Maehler, ed. <i>Pindari carmina cum fragmentis post Brunonem Snell</i> . 8. Aufl. Leipzig, 1987–9.
<i>Syll.Sim.</i>	<i>Sylloge Simonidea</i>
<i>test.</i>	<i>testimonium</i>
<i>TrGF</i>	<i>Tragicorum graecorum fragmenta</i> . eds. B. Snell, R. Kannicht and S. Radt. 5 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986–2004.
V.	Voigt, E.-M., ed. <i>Sappho et Alcaeus. Fragmenta</i> . Amsterdam, 1971.
V. ²	Vahlen, J. <i>Ennianae poesis reliquiae</i> . 2nd ed. Amsterdam, 1967.
van Groningen	van Groningen, B.A. <i>Euphorion</i> . Amsterdam, 1977.
W	West, M.L., ed. <i>Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati</i> . 2 vols. 2nd ed. Oxford, 1992.
Σ	scholion

INTRODUCTION

Peter Bing and Jon Steffen Bruss

Suppose for a moment that you are visiting a pan-Hellenic shrine such as Delphi in the third century B.C., or taking a stroll through the agora of a major Greek city such as Athens, or through one of its cemeteries. What would you see? In this period, early in the Hellenistic Age, you would in all likelihood see great numbers of inscribed monuments wherever you looked, amongst many other sights.¹ At the shrine you might—if you were literate—read inscriptions on many of the dedications to the gods, or peruse the honors bestowed on the sanctuary’s special benefactors; you might even glance at temple inventories. In the city’s agora you might note laws engraved on stelae, decrees, accounts, commemorations of important civic events and prominent individuals.² In cemeteries you would see large numbers of inscriptions adorning the grave markers, often consisting of no more than the deceased’s name and parentage.

Amid this great mass of inscribed texts, there were certainly also epigrams.³ This term, in its most basic sense, signifies no more than “inscription,” a text engraved upon an object. But already from its earliest attestations (in Herodotus and Thucydides), the word was used preeminently of one epigraphic subset, the verse-inscription—short poems, most often engraved on tombstones, religious offerings, or honorific monuments.⁴ The earliest were in hexameters; occasionally there were iambs; but from the latter part of the sixth century, elegiac couplets grew ever more prominent until, by the fourth, they largely

¹ We gratefully acknowledge the advice of Professors Joseph W. Day, Catherine Keesling and Julia Lougovaya regarding epigraphic matters. As we sometimes went our own way nonetheless, they are not to blame for faults that remain.

² In the early period, many of these were as likely to be in city sanctuaries.

³ On inscribed epigram, see Day, Petrovic, and Bettenworth in this volume.

⁴ See generally Puelma (1996). He points out the striking fact (125, n. 9) that prior to imperial times no *poet* ever refers to a poem as ἐπίγραμμα. For the related term, ἐλεγείον, which appears sometimes to be synonymous (Thuc. 1.132.2, Hdt. *Vit. Hom.* 36, lines 512–6), and is used by poets of inscribed epigram (*CEG* 700.3; 819.5, 13; 888.19; 889.8), see Gutzwiller (1998b: 47–9) and Petrovic in this volume.

supplanted the other forms.⁵ Verse was not the medium of laws, decrees, accounts, or other forms of civic or religious record-keeping. Nor was it even all that common in the three main categories in which epigrams appear—sepulchral, dedicatory, and honorific.⁶

Indeed, verse inscriptions comprise only a small part of the larger epigraphic landscape—a fact easily forgotten by students and scholars who encounter them mainly in books that take these as their exclusive subject, the weighty tomes that form our standard academic editions of inscribed epigram.⁷ At a place where one might expect large quantities, for example a prestigious pan-Hellenic shrine like Delphi, they are remarkably scarce. As A. Jacquemin has noted with regard only to dedications, “the small number of metrical inscriptions of dedicatory type or commenting on offerings, just 21 out of an ensemble of 238 documents, is astonishing in a sanctuary as important as Delphi, which is moreover consecrated to Apollo, god of poetry.”⁸ Dedications, however, form only one group out of the roughly 2,000 inscriptions contained in the *Fouilles de Delphes*, and other epigrammatic types are virtually non-existent there (tombs are generally prohibited at shrines). Thus, the proportion of verse-inscriptions out of the epigraphic total at Delphi is just over 1%. Notable, too, is that the epigrams were not somehow segregated from the larger mass of prose inscriptions of whatever type (dedicatory, funerary, administrative, honorific, etc.); that is, they were not set apart and easy to find. At many sanctuaries the figures are just as low.⁹

⁵ Note, however, that hexametric inscriptions still do occur. Their conventionality is suggested in the *Laws* (958e), where Plato’s Athenian stipulates that tombstones “shall be only as large as is needed to fit an encomium of no more than four heroic verses (μὴ πλείω τεττάρων ἡρωικῶν στίχων, i.e. hexameters) about the deceased’s life.”

⁶ As Day notes in this volume (n. 33), honorific epigrams are often subsumed in the category of dedications.

⁷ For modern editions of epigrams, see below in this chapter.

⁸ Jacquemin (1995: 155): “Le petit nombre d’inscriptions métriques relevant du type de la dédicace ou du commentaire d’offrandes, 21 sur un ensemble de 238 documents, peut étonner dans un sanctuaire aussi important que Delphes qui est de surcroît consacré à Apollon, dieu de la poésie.” Her figures cover the period from the sixth century B.C. through the third A.D. At some shrines (though by no means all) the proportion of verse-dedications is higher. Jacquemin compares the dedications on the Acropolis (where Raubitschek tabulates 141 metrical inscriptions out of 341 dedications total, i.e., 41%) and on Delos, where between the seventh and mid-second centuries we find 22 epigrams out of 109 dedicatory inscriptions (i.e., just over 20%). Jacquemin (1995: 155–7) suggests by way of explanation that Athens had far more wealthy individuals who wanted to commemorate their dedications in verse. At Delphi and Delos, by contrast, fewer individuals made dedications.

⁹ Prof. C. Keesling notes *per litteras* (16 August, 2006) that at many shrines inscribed

Even at Athens, where epigrams survive in fair numbers, and appear to have been more plentiful than elsewhere, the proportion is surprisingly small. To be sure, up through the sixth century B.C., about one in four surviving inscriptions there is metrical.¹⁰ One explanation for this relatively high ratio is that inscribed monuments were still rare at this time and the domain of the élite.¹¹ Only aristocrats had the resources to set monuments and the education to see how verse inscription could proclaim and memorialize their status: for them, the genre's traditional epic style, a function of its hexametric and elegiac form, proved appealing inasmuch as it let them set their accomplishments within a heroic framework.¹² Yet if, as suggested at the outset, we picture ourselves as Hellenistic visitors of the third century B.C., many of those inscribed monuments of archaic Attica known today would vanish from view—casualties of the Persian sack of Athens in 480, or “Perserschutt” as it is commonly called.¹³ In the subsequent two centuries, the fifth and the fourth, when inscribing texts became far more common, the ratio of verse to prose sinks dramatically. Of surviving fifth century Attic inscriptions, epigrams make up only slightly more than 8%; in the fourth century that figure drops to ca. 4%.¹⁴

dedications of any kind (metrical or prose) were rare: “On Delos, on Samos, and at the Ptoon in Boiotia, there were hundreds of statue dedications, but far fewer inscriptions of any kind than we get from Athens.”

¹⁰ This rough approximation comes from the chart in Hedrick (1999: 392), which shows roughly 450 Attic inscriptions between 750 and 500. Of these (following Hansen's *CEG* count) there are 59 sepulchral epigrams, and 54 dedicatory epigrams, i.e., 113 epigrams out of 450 total, or ca. 25%. Yet even in archaic Athens, verse-inscriptions did not necessarily stand out, since, as J. Lougovaya notes, “laws... were inscribed in a ‘monumental’ way, ... and probably took more place in the epigraphic landscape of the city than ceramic or bronze vases with verse-inscriptions or even smaller objects such as, e.g., a pomegranite with *CEG* 282.” (email 9/12/06).

¹¹ Powell (1991: 183–4) states that, judging by early verse-inscriptions, “overall our impression is that Greek literacy first flourished in an aristocratic world that is socially symposiastic and temperamentally agonistic, much like the life in the palace of Alkinoos described by Homer.” Yet, as J. Lougovaya reminds us, aristocratic wealth and education did not everywhere lead to the use of epigrams. At archaic Corinth, for instance, we find very few verse-inscriptions despite the city's wealth, apparent literacy (graffiti), and poetic tradition.

¹² Cf. Friedländer and Hoffleit (1948): “the thorough epic style... shaped the conception of life” (30), giving “to the solemn moments of their lives a Homeric cast” (9); in this way, “men and action receive something of the dignity and strength of the epos” (13). Recently, as Day notes in this volume, Lougovaya (2004) has argued that epigram's generic model is to be sought rather in consolatory or commemorative sympotic elegy. As with epic, we would be dealing with elite self-representation.

¹³ See generally Keesling (2003b).

¹⁴ Hedrick (1999: 390–1) estimates that there were ca. 1,500 Attic inscriptions in the fifth century. Of these (following Hansen's collection in the first volume of *CEG*)

Thus even in Attica, where its numerous inscriptions have led historians to speak of an Athenian “epigraphic habit,”¹⁵ inscribing epigrams in particular was hardly habitual. Rather, by the Hellenistic Age it forms only a marginal part of the total epigraphic picture. We see this not just in its scant numbers, but also in the fact that its poets were mostly anonymous,¹⁶ clearly subordinate to the patrons who commissioned verses for family tombs or sacred offerings. As M. Fantuzzi puts it,¹⁷ “the history of the archaic and early classical inscribed epigram is the history of a ‘lesser literature’, more subordinated to, than operating in parallel with, orally transmitted verse. Such poems are satisfied with anonymity.” In fact, the earliest poetic signatures in verse-inscriptions do not come before the late fifth and early fourth centuries with Symmachus of Pellana and, in the second half of the fourth century, with Ion of Samos—neither a household name.¹⁸ Such signatures never grow common. Throughout the genre’s history, moreover, many patrons did not trouble to hire professionals to compose their epigrams; they just did it themselves.¹⁹

If, then, the epigram remained a mostly minor genre through much of the fourth century, one which people would have encountered only

there are 45 sepulchral epigrams, 64 dedicatory epigrams on the Acropolis, 14 from elsewhere in Attica; i.e., 123 Attic epigrams out of 1,500 total, or ca. 8.2%. Hedrick estimates ca. 4,912 Attic inscriptions for the fourth century. Of these (following Hansen’s *CEG* count) there are 160 sepulchral epigrams, 42 dedicatory epigrams, and 4 miscellaneous epigrams; i.e., 206 Attic epigrams out of 4,912 total, or ca. 4.2%. It is worth noting that Gallavotti (1979) redefined many epigrams as metrical, which would greatly enlarge the proportion of verse-inscriptions. Few scholars, however, accept his findings.

¹⁵ MacMullen (1982) popularized the phrase “epigraphic habit”; Merrit (1940: 91) had, however, already spoken of “the democratic habit of inscribing things on stone.” The phrase is picked up by, e.g., Hedrick (1999) and Bodet (2001: 13): “the epigraphic habit of Athens.”

¹⁶ Noted already by Kaibel (1873: 436). On this phenomenon see more recently Gutzwiller (1998b: 10–1).

¹⁷ Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 288).

¹⁸ For Symmachus, cf. *CEG* 888.18–9, with Hansen’s note on *tit. ii* for further instances such as Ion’s (*CEG* 819.5–6, 13).

¹⁹ See von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf’s tart observation about early sepulchral inscriptions (1924: 1.123): “Viele Grabschriften sind so stümperhaft dass sie den Dilletanten verraten.” A striking example of poor, yet plentiful, epigraphic verse, from the mid-third century B.C., is the series of poems inscribed at the sanctuary of Artemidorus of Perge on Thera (*IG* XII 3 nos. 421–2 and 464, with Suppl. nos. 1333–50). It is hard to imagine that Artemidorus paid a professional to compose these. If he did, he was badly swindled.

sporadically and in small numbers, how do we explain the unprecedented surge of interest on the part of major Hellenistic poets, who clearly studied and absorbed the genre's epigraphic conventions, and brought it to a new creative flowering not just as an inscribed, but as a literary form? For that is precisely what happened in the time comprising this volume's focus, from the death of Alexander the Great in 323 (the conventional start of the Hellenistic Age) through the publication of Philip's *Garland* ca. A.D 40.²⁰ In what circumstances would these poets have encountered the scattered monuments, and been intrigued by the poems engraved on them? How did it occur to them to transform the genre from epigraphic obscurity to fashionable literature (important enough to merit a Brill Companion)?²¹

A concrete instance may give such questions added point: consider one of the pioneers of literary epigram, Asclepiades, a native of Samos (late fourth and early third century B.C.). What would his experience of inscribed epigram have been? We have, of course, no way of knowing what journeys he undertook while learning his craft. But the picture in his native Samos is striking. At the Heraion of Samos from the seventh through the fourth centuries there are all of 7 epigrams recorded by Hansen (another 3 sepulchral poems make up the island's total in *CEG*).²² While Asclepiades' surviving poems are chiefly erotic, his dedicatory and sepulchral epigrams (27, 29–31, 41 GP) leave no doubt that he was thoroughly conversant with the type.²³ Where did

²⁰ On the date, see Argentieri in this volume.

²¹ N.b. we are talking here about verse-, not prose-inscriptions. Familiarity with the latter, which (as we have argued) were far more plentiful, would have sufficed to generate in viewers the expectation that epigram, too, as an inscribed text, would be set on a physical object in a fixed location. As detailed below, in their book-epigrams the Hellenistic poets exploited a basic familiarity with the norms of epigraphic material setting to incite their audience to imagine such contexts in the act of reading.

²² Literary sources, for their part, transmit only three inscribed epigrams from Samos. This small number (not all genuine, moreover) suggests that it is not because large quantities of inscribed epigrams have been lost on Samos that their epigraphic presence there is so meager, cf. Preger (1891: 89–91) #108 = Anon. 101 *FGE* (Page doubts its authenticity), #109 = "Simonides" 5 *FGE* (the epigram of Mandrocles, builder of Darius' bridge across the Bosphoros, Hdt. 4.88), and #110.

²³ Indeed, the predominance of erotic and sympotic epigram may simply be due to the taste of Meleager, whose anthology, the *Garland*, is our main source for Asclepiades (on Meleager, see Argentieri in this volume). That, at least, is suggested by the case of the Samian poet's younger contemporary, Posidippus, whose known oeuvre was likewise dominated, until recently, by erotic and sympotic poems. With the publication of the

he learn it? Not, it appears, from encountering verse-inscriptions on his native isle.²⁴

Richard Reitzenstein thought that what spurred the development of epigram as literature in the Hellenistic period was not so much a sudden interest in the actual monuments on which such poems were inscribed, but the collection of inscribed epigrams into books: with that step, as he pointedly stated (1907: col. 81), “die Vorbedingungen für eine literarische Ausgestaltung dieser Dichtungsart sind... gegeben; aus den Epigramm-Sammlungen d.h. Epigramm-Büchern mußte das Buch-Epigramm erwachsen.”²⁵ While this may not be the whole story, it clearly comprises an important part of it. The fourth century did indeed see the first collections of inscribed epigram.²⁶ And it is

Milan Posidippus papyrus, however, it has become clear that such poems formed only a small part of his output.

²⁴ Asclepiades’ apparent presence in proxeny decrees of 276/5 or 273/2 B.C. at Delphi together with fellow epigrammatist, Posidippus (*test.* *2 AB = *test.* 1 Guichard)—in thanks for epigrams produced for inscription at the sanctuary?²—and at Histieia on Euboea in ca. 266 B.C. (*test.* 2 Guichard), certainly suggests that he was active professionally abroad.

That Samos could produce a poet of inscribed epigram is clear from the example of Asclepiades’ countryman and possibly older contemporary, Ion of Samos (mentioned above as one of the first poets of inscribed epigram to put his signature on a work). This poet proudly proclaims his place of origin at the close of one of his two well-preserved epigrams (*CEG* 819.13, ἐξάμο ἀμφιρύτ[ας] τεύξε ἐλεγείον “Ἴων), giving it a poetic flourish with the adjective ἀμφιρύτ[ας], a standing epithet of islands in the *Odyssey* and *Homeric Hymn Apollo*, by which the poet underlines his own poetic culture, and that of his island. It is telling, however, that Ion is known to us not through work on Samos, but from a large statuary group dedicated by the Lacedaemonians at Delphi, whose base bears epigrams celebrating the Spartan naval victory over Athens at Aegospotami (*CEG* 819; cf. Paus. 10.9.7–10). Though the monument itself probably dates from shortly after the Spartan victory in 405, its inscription is thought to have been added between 350 and 300; cf. Hansen (1989: 224), *ad loc.*

²⁵ This is a pithy restatement of his earlier position (1893: 104–5): “solche sofort für das Buch gedichteten Epigramme sind nur unter der Voraussetzung denkbar, dass schon vorher die wirklich für den Stein gedichteten und auf Stein überlieferten ‘Aufschriften’ in Büchern gesammelt wurden, auch nach ihrer formellen Seite Beachtung und Interesse gewonnen hatten. Die für das Buch gedichteten Epigramme setzen als Vorläufer Epigrammbücher voraus, und diese im wesentlichen ein allgemeines Beachten des Epigramms als Kunstwerk.”

²⁶ See Philochorus’ *Epigrammata Attika*, *Suda* s.v. Philochoros Φ 441 A d1 = *FGrH* 328 *test.* 1. Sider in this volume argues that a *Sylloge Simonidea* may already have existed in the fifth century (though, as he acknowledges, many assign it a Hellenistic date), and Gutzwiller has recently proposed that the collection known as the pseudo-Aristotelian *Peplos*, which contained epitaphic couplets on mythical heroes (in addition to prose genealogies and information about the forces under their command), was a pre-Hellenistic peripatetic compilation; see Gutzwiller (forthcoming 2007). J. Lougovaya suggests, further, that common formulae among early epigrams suggest that copybooks (or pat-

certainly true that once epigrams were gathered into books, readers could peruse, study, and enjoy them in quantity, rather than relying on chance encounters with individual monuments. For poets in particular, collections of inscribed epigrams could provide a source for emulation.²⁷ The traditional textuality of epigram—the only poetic genre that, from the start, was geared toward written rather than oral transmission, and reception through reading rather than performance—doubtless appealed to Hellenistic poets' interest in the materiality of the text.²⁸ But more, the availability of such material, largely ignored in the mainstream, and certainly unmined as a source of poetic inspiration, would have played to these poets' bent for seeking out and developing precisely those genres that had previously been marginal (in addition to epigram, one thinks especially of mimes, hymns, "bucolic" song). To that extent, the sudden devotion to epigram on the part of major poets of the day reflects a typical Hellenistic move.

Inscribed epigram's transition from monument to scroll²⁹ occurred in another important area as well: in citation by prose-authors of the fifth and fourth centuries. This we can trace to the genre's one brush with glory prior to the Hellenistic period, which came in the wake of the Persian Wars.³⁰ Here, for the first time, epigram was used as an instrument of state. Not just individuals (as mostly before), but cities—even those with no strong earlier tradition of verse-inscription (such as Sparta)—now commemorate their wartime dead through public monuments, *polyandria*, either on the battlefield or in the agora (e.g., *CEG* 1–3, Athens, dated to between 490 and 470 B.C.); at the same time they make collective offerings at shrines to celebrate their military achievements. Many such monuments bore epigrams,³¹ and

tern books, as they are also called) may have existed early on, and that these circulated among sculptors and stone-cutters: "What perhaps happened in the fourth century was that inscriptional epigrams were collected for circulation as reading material for pleasure, as opposed to earlier professional use by stone-cutters" (email 9/12/06).

²⁷ On the interplay between inscribed and literary epigram, see Bettenworth in this volume; Bruss (2005b) explores literary borrowings from inscribed sepulchral epigram.

²⁸ On this aspect of Hellenistic poetry, see Bing (1988b).

²⁹ This transition has been traced by Bing (1995b), Gutzwiller (1998b), and Meyer (2005: 96–101), *inter alios*.

³⁰ Cf. Wilamowitz (1924: 1.324).

³¹ From the battlefield see, e.g., the epigrams at Thermopylae cited by Herodotus 7.228. For monuments in the city, the public monument at Athens bearing the "Persian War Epigrams," *IG* I³ 503/4, incorporating the new fragment allowing us to reconstruct the monument, cf. Matthaiou (1988: 118–22) and (2000–3); *SEG* 38 (1988: 9,

it is a measure of their impact and prestige that some of these were attributed to so prominent a poet as Simonides—that is, epigram could be an artistically reputable genre, one worthy of collection and for which a poet of considerable standing might write (even if this was not his principle focus). Nor was their influence confined to the site of their inscription. Rather, epigrams came to interest historians, orators, and philosophers, by whom they were now cited, thus entering the literary tradition.³² Whether in collections or citation, then, the genre became available at a remove from its inscribed setting, as a secondary manifestation, incorporated into books. Here, these epigrams become in some sense meta-epigrammatic, or about inscribed epigram.

When, in the outgoing fourth and early third centuries, Hellenistic poets increasingly came to write epigram as literature, they likewise reflected on their epigraphic model, particularly when (as often) they followed the basic inscriptional types. Conceived now with a view toward reception apart from a functional setting in a landscape, and intended to be read (also) on papyrus, or even within an epigram collection, these types yielded a new effect—one that poets of the age evidently found appealing. For while inscribed epigrams characteristically point to their setting, using near-field *deixis* to refer to the particular object they accompany (e.g., τὸδε... ἀνέθηκε), or to the place in which they stand (e.g., ἐνθάδε κεῖται), those places and objects lose their frame of reference when translated into the very different context of the book: literary epigram retains the inscriptions' conventional *deixis*, but suddenly there is no “there” there. The Hellenistic poets transformed that lack into a bonus, using it to spur readers' imaginations, creating thereby an element of play, an *Ergänzungspiel*,³³ that at once invites readers to reflect on the aesthetics of inscriptional epigram, and contemplate the very different circumstances of the book.

We glimpse the genre's own awareness that inscribed epigram had itself become a topic of Hellenistic epigram in a remarkable verse-inscription from Delos. The poem was incised on a block from the base of a monument over 25 feet long, bearing a bronze statuary

no. 29) and *SEG* 51 (2001: 17–8, no. 44); the two earlier-known fragments are *CEG* 2 and “Simonides” 20 *FGE*, on which see Page (1981: 219–25). For collective offerings, see, e.g., the serpent-column with its golden tripod dedicated by the victors at Delphi (Hdt. 9.81; epigram cited by Thuc. 1.132.2).

³² On such citations see Petrovic in this volume.

³³ See Bing (1995b) together with Hunter (1992: 113–23, esp. 114) and Meyer (1993), (2005), and in this volume.

group by the Athenian sculptor Niceratus (7), and dedicated by a certain Sosicrates (8) to commemorate a victory over the Gauls (most likely in 275/4 B.C.) by Philetaerus, founder of the Attalid dynasty at Pergamon. The monument, which held a prominent place along the sacred way on Delos, was probably erected before Philetaerus' death in 262 (*IG XI 4 1105* = Durrbach, *Choix* #31):³⁴

ὦ μάκαρ ὦ Φιλέταιρε, σὺ καὶ θείοισιν αἰοδοῖς
καὶ πλάστησιν, ἄναξ, εὐπαλάμοισι μέλεις·
οἱ τὸ σὸν ἐξενέπουσι μέγα κράτος, οἱ μὲν ἐν ὕμνοις,
οἱ δὲ χερῶν τέχνας δεικνύμενοι σφετέρων,
ὥς ποτε δυσπολέμοις Γαλάταις θοὸν Ἄρεα μείζας 5
ἥλησας οἰκείων πολλὸν ὑπερθεῖν ὄρων·
ὧν ἔνεκεν τάδε σοι Νικηράτου ἔκκριτα ἔργα
Σωσικράτης Δήλωι θῆκεν ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ,
μνήμα καὶ ἐσσομένοισιν αἰοίδιμον· οὐδέ κεν αὐτὸς
Ἥφαιστος τέχνην τῶν γε ὀνόσασατ' ἐσιδὼν. 10

O blessed Philetaerus, you captivate both divine singers
and dextrous sculptors, lord.
These proclaim your mighty power, the ones in hymns,
the others by showing the skill of their hands,
how once joining in swift combat with those ill-omened warriors, the
Gauls,
you drove them far beyond your own borders,
on account of which, these choice works by Niceratus
Sosicrates dedicated to you in sea-girt Delos,
a monument to be the subject of song for men of the future. Not even
Hephaestus himself would disdain the art upon seeing it.

This artful poem, a model of Attalid ambition in Hellenistic politics and culture,³⁵ proclaims its refinement from its opening words, the highly poetic doubled ὦ,³⁶ and its diction is studiously poetic throughout.³⁷

³⁴ For recent discussion of this epigram (with bibliography), see Barbantani (2001: 86, 214–5).

³⁵ Another example of the very high quality of inscriptional verse cultivated under the Attalids is the late third century dedicatory epigram from Pergamon, *SGO* 06/02/05.

³⁶ For ὦ μάκαρ at the start of a hexameter, cf. already *Iliad* 3.182 (Priam expressing to Helen his admiration for Menelaus: ὦ μάκαρ Ἀτρεΐδῃ). The doubled ὦ in combination with μάκαρ occurs at Euripides' *Phaethon* 240 (ὦ μάκαρ, ὦ βασιλεὺς).

³⁷ Thus θεῖος (1) is a standing epithet of singers in the *Odyssey*; μέγα κράτος (2) is a stock combination in the *Iliad*, usually coming just after the feminine caesura, as here (cf. *Il.* 11.752, etc.); ἐξενέπουσι, “proclaim” (3), is Pindaric (cf. *Nem.* 4.33, *Ol.* 8.20); the phrase Ἄρεα μείζας, “join battle” (5), occurs already in Alcaeus fr. 330 LP; ἀμφιρύτη, “sea-girt” (8), is a standing epithet of islands already in Homer (e.g. *Od.* 1.50, of Delos

In its encomiastic style it recalls some of the epigrams from the Milan Posidippus papyrus. For example, its pronounced pairing of musical and sculptural arts (καὶ... καὶ, 1–2; οἱ μὲν... οἱ δὲ, 3–4; Νικηράτου ἔκκριτα ἔργα... μνήμα ἀοίδιμον, 7, 9) reminds one of the careful reciprocity of sculptural and poetic *technē* in the poem on Hecataeus' statue of Philitas of Cos, 63 AB.³⁸ Likewise, its proud assertion of royal accomplishment recalls poem 78 AB of the Milan Posidippus papyrus, where the Ptolemaic queen Berenice proclaims her fame as a fitting subject for song, εἴπατε, πάντες ἀοιδοί, ἐμὸν [κ]λέος, εἴ[τ]ι π[ο]τ' ἀρέσκει / γνωστὰ λέγειν (1–2), and commands the Macedonians to “sing Queen Berenice's crown” (...ἀεῖδετε τὸν Βερ[ε]νίκη[ς] / τῆς βασιλευούσης, ὦ Μακέτα[ι], στέφανον, 13–4).³⁹ In this connection it is worth noting that in both poems the epigram characterizes itself and its own performance in terms of “song”:⁴⁰ just as the poet of the Milan epigram clearly belongs among the πάντες ἀοιδοί addressed in line 1, and fulfills the command to “tell of my fame” at once by means of his poem, even so the poet of the Attalid verse-inscription counts among the “divine singers” honoring the king, every bit as much as the monument's maker, Niceratus, counts among the sculptors; and just as the demand in Posidippus that the Macedonians “sing the crown” (13–4) is immediately satisfied in the act of reading this selfsame poem, even so the verse-inscription's claim that its monument will be the subject of song “also for those hereafter” (9) implies that the epigram itself is a present instance thereof.

This last-mentioned verse, μνήμα καὶ ἐσσομένοισιν ἀοίδιμον (9), is especially revealing, both for what it says about the epigram's artistry and about its understanding of its own genre. For the phrase

at *H.H. Ap.* 27); its final clause, οὐδέ κεν αὐτὸς, etc. (9–10), recalls Iliadic descriptions of gods who do not scorn (aor. opt. of ὄνομαι with circumstantial participle) the prowess of mortals, *Il.* 17.398–9 (οὐδέ κ' Ἄρης λαοσσός οὐδέ κ' Ἀθήνη / τὸν γε ἰδοῦσ' ὀνόσαιτ'), 13.126–8 (φάλαγγες / καρτεραί, ὅς οὔτ' ἄν κεν Ἄρης ὀνόσαιτο μετελθὼν / οὔτε κ' Ἀθηναίη λαοσσός). It also resembles the description of Aristis by Simichidas in Theocritus *Id.* 7.100–1: ὃν οὐδέ κεν αὐτὸς ἀεΐδεν / Φοῖβος σὺν φόρμυγι παρὰ τριπόδεσσι μεγάροι (“whom Apollo himself would not mind having sing to the lyre in his sanctuary”). As Apollo there is the ultimate authority in song, so here Hephaestus in the sculptor's craft (τέχνην).

³⁸ For this “reciprocity between poetry and bronze sculpture” in 63 AB, see Männlein-Robert in this volume.

³⁹ On encomiastic epigram for royalty and nobility, see Ambühl in this volume.

⁴⁰ This squares with Puelma's observation (1996: 125) that epigrams do not refer to themselves as ἐπίγραμμα until quite late, whereas Meleager's poem, for example, refers to contents of the *Garland* as ἀοιδά (1), ὕμνοι (2, 7), μέλισμα (35), and ἔλεγχοι (36).

ἔσσομένοισιν ἀοίδιμον is a deliberate variation on—and inversion of—the single instance of ἀοίδιμος in Homer, Helen’s statement at *Il.* 6.357–8 that Zeus placed an evil doom on her and Paris, ὥς καὶ ὀπίσσω / ἀνθρώποισι πελώμεθ’ ἀοίδιμοι ἔσσομένοισι, “so that after this we should be a subject of song for men hereafter.” What is particularly striking here is that while in Homer the subjects of future song are epic heroes, in our epigram that subject becomes the inscribed monument itself (μνῆμα). And as the discussion of this verse in the preceding paragraph makes clear, ἀοίδιμος here scarcely refers to future epics about this monument, but rather to poems of the same type as that on the statue-base, to *epigrams*—epigrams about an epigram.⁴¹ These will not be inscribed, however: we would not expect inscriptions celebrating inscriptions. Our monument predicts epigrams *on* a monument only in the sense of being *about* that monument: literary epigrams. With this prediction, moreover, it reenacts on the level of a single memorial the historical development of literary epigram from inscription as a whole. For in their relationship to an inscribed source, these imagined poems resemble many of the most interesting literary epigrams of the Hellenistic period, ecphrases and poems that take as their theme the act of reading inscriptions.⁴²

Till now we have been looking at the development of literary epigram out of the common inscriptional types. Another important strand, however, went into the complex fabric of Hellenistic literary epigram, namely sympotic and erotic elegy.⁴³ As with inscribed epigram, a crucial mediating factor in this development was the book. Collections of short elegy, such as that attributed to Theognis, containing poems that were often abbreviated or excerpted, likely became available at about the same time as collections of inscribed epigram, by the fourth century B.C.⁴⁴ As Gutzwiller has said (1998b: 117), “in collected form, the genres of elegy and epigram lost much of their original distinctness, which had

⁴¹ Inscribed epigram may speak of a μνῆμα...ἔσσομένοισιν (*CEG* 136.2), but our inscription takes the conventional phrasing a step further by styling its μνῆμα as καὶ ἔσσομένοισιν ἀοίδιμον.

⁴² See Walsh (1990), Meyer (2005) and Meyer and Männlein-Robert in this volume.

⁴³ For a cautious view of this relationship, see Bowie in this volume.

⁴⁴ West (1974: 40–64) dates what he considers the earliest Theognidean collection, the *florilegium purum* (lines 19–254), to ca. 300. Others date it earlier; cf. Reitzenstein (1893: 55, 79–85): “um 400, oder doch nicht lange danach” (84); Bowie (1997: 61–5); and Gutzwiller (1998b: 116–7).

derived from the symposium setting for the one and the inscriptional setting for the other. The remaining differences in content and length were insufficient to maintain separate generic status.”⁴⁵ Or in the blunt formulation of Nisbet, who cuts right to the nub of the matter, literary epigram is “what happens when scissors meet elegy.”⁴⁶

The confluence of sympotic and erotic elegy and traditional types of verse-inscription enlarged the thematic scope of literary epigram. Thus by the third century B.C. the meaning of the term itself expanded so as to comprise any brief, mainly elegiac poem, whether of the conventional epigraphic kind, or erotic-sympotic.⁴⁷ The latter element is indeed so prevalent in the surviving corpus—due probably to Meleager’s tastes in compiling his *Garland*, which (as the contents of the Milan Posidippus papyrus suggest) excluded many other types—that it led Reitzenstein to posit that literary epigram in general arose as a sympotic passtime: revellers improvised verses over wine and performed them on the spot.⁴⁸ Certainly, there are epigrams that represent epigrammatic composition as occurring this way. Hedylus’ epigram 5 GP (= Athen. 11.472f) is a particularly vivid example:

Πίνωμεν· καὶ γάρ τι νέον, καὶ γάρ τι παρ’ οἶνον
εὖροιμ’ ἂν λεπτὸν καὶ τι μελιχρὸν ἔπος.
Ἀλλὰ κάδοις Χίου με κατὰβρεχε, καὶ λέγε· Παῖζε,
Ἡδύλε· μισῶ ζῆν εἰς κενὸν, οὐ μεθύων.

Let’s drink, ‘cause maybe there’s something new, maybe in my cups
I’ll come up with something delicate, some sweet sort of epigram.⁴⁹
But drown me in jars of Chian and say, “Play,
Hedylus.” I hate living in vain—not being sauced, that is.

Here, drinking inspires the creation of epigram. Or does it? The opening exhortation, πίνωμεν, aimed at fellow drinkers in the sympotic group,

⁴⁵ See also Gutzwiller in this volume: “In collected form on a papyrus roll, the elegies of Mimnermus or Theognis would visually be quite similar to epigrams.”

⁴⁶ Cf. his chapter on satiric epigram in this volume.

⁴⁷ The earliest instances of this expanded usage come from papyrus titles of the third century B.C., for instance P.Petrie II 49a (= *SH* 961), entitled σύμμεικτα ἐπιγράμματα, a collection of epigrams by Posidippus (and possibly others), which also includes an elegiac epithalamion for Queen Arsinoë, and P. Vindob. G. 40611, an incipit-list headed τὰ ἐπιζητούμενα τῶν ἐπιγραμμάτων ἐν τῇ α βύβλῳ, amongst which the only previously known poem is an erotic epigram by Asclepiades. Cf. Puelma (1996: 128–9) and Krevans in this volume.

⁴⁸ Thus Reitzenstein (1893: 87–104). His theory is revived by Cameron (1995: 71–103).

⁴⁹ For ἔπος so used, see Anyte 4 GP (= *AP* 7.724).

clearly evokes the typical *incipits* of Alcaeus (πώνωμεν fr. 346 V., and πῶνε[.....]Μελάνιππ' ἄμ' ἔμοι fr. 38 V.). Similarly κάδος (3), “storage jar” (of undiluted wine!), recalls earlier sympotic verse. As Gow-Page (1965: 2.293) note *ad loc.*, this term is “used of vessels for storing... or carrying liquids,” but “not, except in comic exaggeration,... of drinking vessels.” In fact prior to Hedylus, who uses it in this way again at 6.2 GP, only Anacreon employs it of a drinking vessel (*PMG* 373.2–3). There, linking drink and song as here, the speaker boasts “I drained a κάδος of wine, and now gracefully strum my lovely lyre in a serenade to my pretty girl” (οἴνου δ' ἐξέπιον κάδον· νῦν δ' ἄβρῶς ἐρόεσσαν / ψάλλω πηκτίδα τῇ φίλῃ κωμάζων †παιδὶ ἄβρῃ†). Hedylus may be alluding directly to Anacreon here, outdoing the Archaic poet's singular κάδον with his plural κάδοις, topping his relatively restrained ἐξέπιον with the more boisterous κατάβρεχε, and perhaps picking up ἄβρῶς in λεπτόν and μελιχρόν. With the command to say “Παίζε” (3), further, he draws on traditional diction of sympotic verse, where it means to “perform poetry,” particularly in a convivial context.⁵⁰ In combination with Πίνωμεν (1), the verb recalls Ion of Chios fr. 27.7 W: πίνωμεν, παίζωμεν. ἴτω διὰ νυκτὸς ἀοιδή (“let's drink, let's play, let song go through the night”), as well as that same poet's prayer to Dionysus fr. 26.15–6 W, δίδου... / πίνειν καὶ παίζειν (“grant us to drink and to play”). In light of such literary precedents, one may well ask: is drinking indeed Hedylus' inspiration, or is it not rather the literary tradition of sympotic song itself, represented by earlier poets like Alcaeus, Anacreon, and Ion of Chios? And isn't it precisely Hedylus' artful deployment of these in this epigram—the only one to which he attached his name as *sphragis*—that produces something fresh (τι νέον), diminutive (λεπτόν), and honey-sweet (μελιχρόν)? In that sense, it is a poem worthy of his name: for with his self-identification as Ἡδύλε (4), “Sweety” (suitably, the diminutive of ἡδύς), the poet's “slight, honey-sweet verse” (λεπτόν... μελιχρόν ἔπος, 2) becomes the virtual embodiment of his name.

No doubt, some epigrams were recited at symposia; some may even have been composed and performed over wine in the course

⁵⁰ See Pind. *Ol.* 1.14–7: [scil. Hieron] ἀγλαίζεται δὲ καὶ / μουσικῶς ἐν ᾠῳ, / οἷα παίζομεν φίλαν / ἄνδρες ἀμφὶ θαμὰ τράπεζαν, cf. also Latin *ludere* as at Cat. 50.2, Virgil *Ecl.* 1.10, 6.1, *Georg.* 4.565, etc. For παίζειν as virtually a *terminus technicus* in Hellenistic poetry, and its relation to παίγνιον and παίγνια as light poems or collections thereof, see Reitzenstein (1893: 87, n. 2).

of the party. Yet it is striking that, of the many sources that describe poetic performance at Hellenistic symposia,⁵¹ not one ever mentions the recital of epigram⁵²—apart, that is, from the scenes envisioned in the epigrams themselves. We must therefore take care not to confuse a poem's depiction of an occasion with the actual circumstances of its composition/reception. "The imitation of oral speech," as Gutzwiller cautions (1998b: 115–6), "no more guarantees that a sympotic epigram was recited than the imitation of written speech guarantees that an inscriptional epigram was inscribed. Reitzenstein's fundamental mistake was to confuse the representation of a speech act with the speech act itself."⁵³ What we have, after all, are the texts—mostly as anthologized by Meleager from earlier collections.

In any case, with its traditional epigraphic types now accessible for scholarly study and poetic elaboration, and its scope broadened to include erotic and sympotic themes, epigram suddenly became all the rage, a hot genre of the early Hellenistic period. Historians and epigraphers may speak of an "epigraphic habit" in Classical Athens and Rome, but the Hellenistic age just as clearly developed a "habit" of writing epigram—an epigrammatic habit. In putting the spotlight on this type of verse, poets were exploring one of those "untrodden paths" which were so much favored by the elite. Virtually all important poets of the third century B.C. tried their hand at it; some of the best, like Callimachus, made it a recurrent focus; a few made it their exclusive specialty, as we see in a proxeny decree of the Aetolian League at Thermon in the year 263/2 (*IG IX* 1² i, 17A.24 = *test.* 3 AB), identifying Posidippus by the title ἐπιγραμματοποιός, "poet of epigram"—the first poet so called.

⁵¹ Richly detailed in Cameron (1995: 71–103).

⁵² The lack of sources outside of epigram regarding its performance stands in sharp contrast to their plentiful availability for other genres, such as epic, choral lyric, tragedy, comedy and even Theognidean elegy. See generally Herington (1985) with his appendices on performance, I–V.

⁵³ For further critique of Reitzenstein's thesis see Giangrande (1968: 93, n. 2) and Bing (2000: 145–7). Yet it is important to emphasize that the evidence as it is simply does not settle the question (generally, see Calinescu (1993); an agnostic position on the Hellenistic period, Bruss (2004) with bibliography). The very presence of the sympotic setting in epigram, the persistence of sympotic practice into the Hellenistic age, esp. also under the sponsorship of the Ptolemies with their grand royal symposia (see Cameron (1995: 71–103); Murray (1996)), and testimonia such as Callimachus fr. 178 Pf., wherein Callimachus details an exchange of (some intellectual) interest, betray a lively sympotic culture rife with intellectual activity (Slater (1982)).

The genre excited interest not just from poets, however. It appealed to patrons, too.⁵⁴ Otto Weinreich, the scholar who first drew attention to the importance of the above-mentioned proxeny-decree from Thermon, shrewdly noted that the reference to Posidippus suggests that he was being honored specifically in his capacity as ἐπιγραμματοποιός, that is as poet of epigrams to be inscribed on monuments and honoring notable men of the League.⁵⁵ As we have observed, verse inscriptions were traditionally anonymous, their poets named only in exceptional cases. Yet the bestowal of proxeny here indicates that there were patrons eager to employ gifted poets in this capacity, and that an epigrammatist might achieve considerable status from their commissions.⁵⁶ The presence of a Posidippus together with a certain Asclepiades (possibly the contemporary epigrammatist and associate of our poet) on a proxeny list at Delphi in the mid 270s (*Fouilles de Delphes* III 3 #192 = *test.* 2 AB), suggests that Posidippus may already have won recognition for his inscribed poems a decade before the honor at Thermon. Further, the poems of the Milan papyrus make it abundantly clear that Posidippus cultivated close ties to those with money and power, in particular the Ptolemies and their courtiers. The works on that papyrus demonstrate, moreover, that patrons recognized the value not only of setting epigrams on splendid monuments, but of setting them in books. With clients like these in far-flung localities, an epigrammatist could become an international star. And with fame came riches. The so-called *Seal of Posidippus* (*SH* 705 = 118 AB) ends with a wish that points to the wealth an epigrammatist could amass: “But in old age may I travel the mystic path to Rhadymanthys, . . . leaving to my children my house

⁵⁴ On royal patronage of epigram, see Ambühl in this volume.

⁵⁵ Weinreich (1918: 439): “Die Vermutung liegt nahe, dass er solche [Epigramme] für den ätolischen Bund gedichtet hat—etwa Grab- oder Weihepigramme für hervorragende Männer des Bundes, Steinepigramme für historische Persönlichkeiten dieser Zeit.”

⁵⁶ Paradoxically, the high status of epigrammatists in the Hellenistic period may be reflected in a story about the early Classical era from the *Vita Aeschyli* (p. 332.5–10 Page), which tells how Aeschylus was defeated by Simonides in a competition to compose an epigram for those who died at Marathon, and therefore abandoned Athens for Sicily in a fit of pique. As Page (1981: 223) rightly insisted, “this tale is likely to be mere gossip of a later age, the fourth century B.C. at earliest;” see, in greater detail, Jacoby (1945: 179–83). The idea that losing an epigram-competition—of all things!—could so crush the self-esteem of a poet like Aeschylus probably projects Hellenistic views of this genre’s eminence back onto an earlier age. Firm evidence for epigram-contests comes, not surprisingly, only in the first century B.C., with an inscription from Thessaly (IG IX, 2 531, lines 48–9) recording the victor in such a competition. We owe this reference to Andrej Petrovic, who examines such contests in a forthcoming paper.

and my fortune” (αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ / γήραι μυστικὸν οἶμον ἐπὶ Ῥαδάμανθον ἰκοίμην/ ... καὶ λείπων τέκνοις δῶμα καὶ ὄλβον ἐμόν, 24, 28). Posidippus’ hope not just for special treatment in the Underworld (travelling “the mystic path to Rhadymanthys”), but to end this life in material prosperity may reflect, as Dickie has shown, the expectations of one initiated in a mystery cult.⁵⁷ Yet in a poem largely concerned with his *poetic* legacy, it stands to reason that the “house and fortune” he leaves behind were acquired as a result of his poetic endeavors.⁵⁸ The most sought-after epigrammatists might certainly grow rich. That much is clear from the story that Hieron II, tyrant of Syracuse from ca. 270 to 215 B.C., paid the poet Archimelus 1,500 bushels of wheat (1000 *medimnoi*) for a single epigram celebrating his royal transport ship, and even shipped the wheat to the poet in the Piraeus at his own expense (Athen. 5.209b = *SH* 202).

Thus in the fiercely ambitious, culturally competitive environment of the Hellenistic successor states, where kings and courtiers vied with one another to attract the finest poets, artists, and thinkers as badges of their own political merit and renown, epigram came to flourish, and epigrammatists to approach the status of celebrity. It was this flowering—or at least a goodly part thereof—that Meleager wove into his *Garland*, the early first century B.C. anthology that was transmitted to Rome, where it inspired further epigrams and new anthologies, including that of Philip, which rounds out the period addressed in this volume.⁵⁹

⁵⁷ Dickie (1998: 74–5).

⁵⁸ On the achievement for which Posidippus hopes to be honored, see further Gauly (2005).

⁵⁹ General overview of the Hellenistic world down to 30 B.C. available in Green (1990); on Ptolemaic Alexandria, Fraser (1972) remains the standard; general history, Walbank (1981). Cultural currents more narrowly considered: philosophy, Brunschwig and Sedley (2003); rhetoric, Walker (2000) and Kennedy (1972); Blum (1977) together with Pfeiffer (1968) include important material on the development of classical scholarship in this period. See, for the intersection of epigram and: (a) philosophy, Gutzwiller (1998b: 91–2, 129–30, 151, 155–62) and Clayman in this volume; (b) rhetoric, Zanker in this volume; (c) philosophy and rhetoric, Männlein-Robert in this volume; (d) classical scholarship, Bing (1988b), Sens (2002a), Sens, Sistakou, Barbantani, Rosen, Fantuzzi, and Acosta-Hughes and Barbantani in this volume.

The transmission of epigrams

Meleager's and Philip's *Stephanoi* were formative to the tradition of epigram's publication and reception. Even today the aesthetic experience of aficionados, students, and scholars of Greek epigram, literary and inscribed alike, bears striking resemblance to that of the earliest readers of epigram-collections in all but the rarest situations: whether originally designed for the book or not, epigrams come to us pre-arranged in published collections. The physical context of both literary and inscribed epigram is divorced from its "original" setting (fictive or real), and readers are automatically implicated in an elaborate *Ergänzungsspiel*, aided by the technical, archeological, epigraphical, and text-critical tools supplied by editors.

The most basic grouping of published epigrams is driven by their origin—or rather, by where modern scholars have "found" these epigrams: generally, inscribed epigrams appear in collections discrete from editions of literary epigrams, and vice versa. Widely practiced, this division has arisen from the divergent technical scholarly approaches to inscribed as opposed to literary epigram: each requires specialist sub-disciplinary training, and each results in editions with very different aims. As necessary as it is, however, the long-standing editorial separation of inscribed from literary epigram has created significant gaps in research and knowledge, one which scholars in recent years have only begun to close.⁶⁰ Our volume addresses this lacuna in general by deliberately bringing together chapters on both inscribed and literary epigram; the rest of this introduction, more specifically, recounts the several basic resources needed for the study of Greek epigram, and briefly narrates how the epigrams as we have them in printed editions have come down to us.

Inscribed Epigram

To examine inscriptions first hand, epigraphists must visit up to hundreds of national and local museums just to assemble a corpus that

⁶⁰ Recent work has been more attuned to this concern, such as Walsh (1991), Bing (1995b), Gutzwiller (1998b: esp. 47–114), Rossi (2001), Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 283–349), and Bruss (2005b), *inter alios*.

would be remotely complete. What they are unable to see for themselves, they may gain access to through photographs. This, too, is a costly and time-consuming task. When neither of these paths lie open to them, epigraphists often fall back on eighteenth or nineteenth century accounts, sketches, and rubbings. In some cases, the original inscription, a photographic reproduction or a sketch is simply not available for geo-political reasons or the like, and editors must default to printed, published citations. To appreciate the accomplishment of the editors of inscribed epigram, it is important to bear in mind the enormity of their work.

The most recent, comprehensive collections of inscribed epigram are those of Merkelbach and Stauber (1998–2004) and Hansen (1983–9). Merkelbach and Stauber (four volumes, with a fifth index volume) print inscribed epigrams recovered from the Greek East—Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine, and the Far East—ranging in date from the fourth century B.C. well into the seventh century A.D. The epigrams, witnessed by the editors mainly in earlier editions or in photos, are organized by geographical location and type (oracular and dedicatory, honorific, architectural, and sepulchral); each epigram is accompanied with publication data, criticism, a textual apparatus, Greek translation, and date (when possible). Hansen’s magnificent work in two volumes contains over 800 epigrams from “old Greece,” the extent of Greek settlement down to 300 B.C., from Spain in the West to Crete in the South, Macedonia in the North and Western Asia Minor in the East. The first volume is dedicated to inscribed epigrams from the eighth to the fifth century B.C., and the second to those from the fourth. Each volume is divided into sepulchral, dedicatory, and miscellaneous epigrams, and within those divisions, by geographical location, with epigrams given in chronological order. Hansen’s work is careful in the extreme with the result that his readings are more faithful—and supplementation more reserved—than for the same epigrams in earlier collections.

Slightly earlier are Peek’s editions of 1955 and 1960, *GVI* and *GG*, respectively. Employing less exacting criteria for what counts as “inscribed,” Peek includes epigrams found on artifacts as well as those transmitted by other sources, such as Herodotus, Thucydides, or *GA*.⁶¹

⁶¹ For example, Peek includes the “Simonidean” epigram on the deceased at Dirphys transmitted as *AP* 16.26 and not regarded by, e.g., Geffcken (1916) and Page (1981: 189) as an authentic inscription.

Peek's travel limitations—his research was interrupted by World War II and the Cold War—necessarily restricted his use of autopsy; instead, he often used photographs, relying also on sketches, rubbings, and earlier publications. Peek's arrangement in *GVI* and *GG* differs markedly from that of his successors. There, epigrams are divided first by formal typology, then listed within those types chronologically, with little or no regard for geographical provenience.⁶² *GVI* spans nearly a millennium and a half, beginning in the eighth century B.C. and carrying forward into late antiquity.

Originally conceived to be much larger and accompanied by a second volume with later inscriptions, Friedländer and Hoffleit (1948) too, suffered from the intervention of World War II. The volume includes a representative sample of epigrams from the eighth century down to 480 B.C., and is divided first by metrical schema (hexameter, elegiac couplet, and iambic and trochaic schemes), then by use (sepulchral, dedicatory, miscellaneous). Epigrams with interesting similarities or differences are often paired, without regard for dating or provenience. The Greek texts appear along with a minimal textual apparatus, comments, English translation, and date.

Serious research on inscribed epigrams also makes use of specialized collections and still earlier editions of epigrams. These include: Ebert (1972) and Moretti (1953), both limited to epigrams on athletic victors; Bernand (1969), epigrams from Greco-Roman Egypt; Hiller von Gärtringen (1926), a selection of historically important epigrammatic inscriptions; Geffcken (1916), who juxtaposes inscribed and literary epigrams in alternating chronological sections; Hoffmann (1893), epigrams down to the mid-third century B.C.; Preger (1891), literarily transmitted inscriptional epigrams exclusive of those in *GA*; and Kaibel (1878), the earliest modern edition of inscribed epigrams. For comparative purposes, Dübner (1871–90) included an appendix of select inscribed epigrams in his edition of *GA*.

⁶² In this respect it resembles important thematic studies, such as Lattimore (1942).

Literary epigram

The labyrinthine transmission of Hellenistic epigrams in *GA* from the time of Meleager down to the creation of the *APL* at the dawn of the fourteenth century spans a millennium and a half.⁶³ Today's printed editions of *GA* rely primarily on two anthologies, known as the *Palatine Anthology* (Latin: *Anthologia Palatina* = *AP*) and the *Planudean Anthology* (*Anthologia Planudea* = *APL*). *APL*, dated to the year A.D. 1301, is the creation of Maximus Planudes, a Byzantine scribe. The ms., now housed in Venice, was, until the nineteenth century publication of *AP*, regarded as *the GA*, though since the discovery of *AP*, it has come to be regarded as inferior both in the breadth of epigrams it includes and in its faithfulness to the transmitted text of the epigrams. *APL* was divided into seven books: I. Declamatory and Descriptive; II. Satirical; III. Sepulchral; IV. Monuments and Statues; V. Christodorus' Epigrams and Epigrams from the Constantinopolitan Hippodrome; VI. Dedicatory; and VII. Amatory. Book 4 of *AP*, containing the proems of earlier anthologists and therefore key to our knowledge of earlier anthologies, is missing in Planudes.

The scholarly recovery of *AP* in the latter part of the eighteenth and in the nineteenth century renewed interest in *GA*. This fifteen-book anthology, produced some time between ca. A.D. 930 and 980,⁶⁴ is now preserved in one codex housed in two locations, Paris and Heidelberg; its epithet *Palatina* recognizes its bestowal upon the Duke of the Palatinate in the seventeenth century. The work of multiple hands, known by scholars today as J, A, A2, B, B2, and B3, *AP* is over seven-hundred pages long; pages 1–452 are the work mainly of A and J; pages 453–706 that of A2, B, B2, B3, and J. Another hand, C, adds lemmata.

It is the relationship of J and C that pushes the provenience of *AP* into the exciting period of the first Byzantine humanism.⁶⁵ J's marginal note at the beginning of *AP* 7, the *epitymbia*, acknowledges his debt to Constantine Cephalas; at a later date, with Cephalas' death still within recent memory, C amended J's note to read, "Lord Constantine Cephalas, of blessed and eternal memory, a man thrice missed." J meanwhile betrays a student relationship with Cephalas in

⁶³ A full account of the history of Greek epigram anthologies is available in Cameron (1993).

⁶⁴ Cameron (1993: 97–9) for paleographical assessments.

⁶⁵ Further, see Lemerle (1971).

his comments on *AP* 7.327. The only reasonable deduction from this, and other telltales, is that both C and J were, respectively, junior and senior fellows at the so-called New Church in Byzantium, where their teacher was none other than Constantine Cephalas (*fl.* 900), working under his headmaster Gregory.

Both men loom large in the intellectual history of medieval Byzantium; and both contributed major epigram segments to *AP*. Cephalas, a collection of classical and late antique epigrams derived ultimately from the anthologies of Meleager and Philip; and Gregory, the fruits of his epigraphical researches—copies of inscribed epigrams found *in situ*—along with the model for Cephalas' own efforts.⁶⁶ It turns out that *AP* is in large part a direct witness to Cephalas' anthology. Books 5–7 and 9–14 bear a strong stamp of Cephalan influence; books 3 and 8 may, but need not, be later; and books 1–2 and 4, contemporary with Cephalas. The poems of *AP* 4, uninteresting as epigrams but important for describing Cephalas' epigram collection, may have been inserted by Cephalas as a poetic foreword to what would have been the first book of his anthology, what is preserved today as *AP* 5. For purposes of recovering Hellenistic-era epigram—and understanding Hellenistic epigram arrangement—the maintenance of Cephalas' editorial habits in the Cephalan books of *AP* prove indispensable. Consider, for example, the pattern of *AP* 6, *anathematica*, inherited from Cephalas:

1–53	thematic ordering, no particular source
54–86	series from Agathias' <i>Cycle</i>
87–108	series from Philip's <i>Stephanos</i>
109–57	series from Meleager's <i>Stephanos</i>
158–78	amalgam of Agathian, Philippan, and Meleagrian poems
179–226	series from Philip's <i>Stephanos</i>
227–61	series from Meleager's <i>Stephanos</i>
314–58	mixed

As can be readily seen from this arrangement, whole series of poems seems to have been taken with some semblance of their original order from earlier anthologies—Meleager's of ca. 100 B.C., Philip's of ca. A.D. 40, and Agathias' of the mid-sixth century A.D. The same phenomenon is discernible in the other Cephalan books, with the result that we can recover Meleagrian and Philippan authors and sometimes, if not

⁶⁶ This argument, with consideration of others, is made in full by Cameron (1993: 108–20).

always, Meleager's and Philip's division by genre and their principles of constructing epigram-sequences.⁶⁷ The purely Meleagrian series in *AP* are: 5.134–215; 6.109–57, 262–313; 351–8; 7.406–506, 646–65, 707–40; 9.313–38, 563–8; 12.36–174, and 256–7; the purely Philippan: 5.104–33; 6.87–108; 227–61; 7.364–405; 622–45; 9.215–312, 402–23; 10.17–25, 100–3; 9.23–46, and 318–27.

It is reasonable to conclude from the Cephalan habits handed down via *AP* that among Cephalas' resources in compiling his anthology were copies of the *Stephanoi* of both Meleager and Philip, though "much reduced versions of the original."⁶⁸ In fact, Cephalas brought these anthologies at least partially intact through a critical period in the transmission of Greek texts: in the ninth century, Byzantine book scribes adopted the more efficient minuscule script, eventually rendering the older uncial manuscripts obsolete; the bulk of ancient Greek literature that survives today comes to us not by way of uncial mss., but minuscule.⁶⁹ Cephalas' transcriptions—really transliterations—from Meleager and Philip putatively participate in this phenomenon; certainly, the scribes of *AP* show no knowledge of earlier, uncial versions. The result of the *Stephanoi*'s passage through the Cephalan bottleneck is a deficit not completely made up by the resulting credit. To his integration of epigrams from the two anthologies into his own is probably owed their disappearance as intact literary works; but to his retrieval of Meleager and Philip is owed our knowledge of them today.⁷⁰

Printed editions of *GA* have been available in the West virtually since the invention of the printing press, the oldest such edited by Giovanni Lascaris (1494), which in turn formed the basis of the 1503 edition by the Venetian printer and polymath Aldo Manuzio,⁷¹ although these earliest editions were familiar with only *APL*.

Since Planudes includes, on the whole, fewer (though sometimes different) epigrams than *AP*, those not included in the fifteen books of *AP* are now traditionally printed as Book 16 of *GA*. Until the eighteenth century, printed editions of *GA* were of *APL* alone. Although the existence of *AP* has been known since 1606, it was not published

⁶⁷ This topic is addressed more completely in this volume by Argentieri and Krevans.

⁶⁸ It is likely that Cephalas had two, variant copies of each ancient *Stephanos* (Cameron 1993: 44–7; quotation on 46).

⁶⁹ Reynolds and Wilson (1968: 50–3).

⁷⁰ On the anthologies of Meleager and Philip, see Argentieri in this volume.

⁷¹ Renouard (1953: 42–3).

in full until the eighteenth century, to a renewal of interest in *GA*. A complete printed edition was first made by Brunck (1772–6), with epigrams organized by author and date. Starting in 1794, Jacobs published an edition in four volumes, plus one of indices, on the same ordering principles as Brunck; to this he added seven volumes of notes or *Animadversiones* (1798–1814). Jacobs produced a second edition, however, (1813–7, edited and reissued by Dübner (1871–90)) revising and augmenting his 1794 edition, and—significantly—restoring the order of the Palatine and Planudean mss., a tradition followed in subsequent editions through the twentieth century—Stadtmüller’s three-volume Greek text of *AP* 1–9 (1894–1906), Paton’s five-volume text and English translation (1916–9), Waltz’ multi-volume, multi-tome text with French translation and notes (1928–), and Beckby’s four-volume text with German translation (1957–8). For the student of Greek epigram down to A.D. 40, notes in these editions draw attention to Meleagrian and Philippan series. A complete facsimile of both *AP* and *APL* is at hand in Preisendanz (1911).

Still standard even after 40 years since they were first published are the epigram editions of Gow-Page (1965) and (1968), as are Page (1975) and (1981). Building on the pioneering work of Radinger (1895) and a few later scholars⁷² who first sought to retrieve from the labyrinth of *GA* those epigrams belonging to Meleager’s *Stephanos*, Gow-Page (1965) identify in *GA* and other sources, such as Athenaeus’ *Deipnosophistae*, papyri, manuscripts of Hellenistic-era poets, and other epigrammatic *sylogai* those literary epigrams from as early as the fourth century down to *circa* 100 B.C. These they print by author (both firmly and spuriously attributed), in alphabetical order, except for Meleager, who comes last, together with anonymous epigrams. Under each author, epigrams are divided by ancient sub-genre, as suggested by the arrangement of the books in *GA*.⁷³ This two-volume work, with introduction, text, and

⁷² Primarily Weißhäupl (1889), Stadtmüller (1894–1906), and Wifstrand (1926); Lenzinger (1965) was in preparation even as Gow-Page (1965) was at press; Gow-Page (1965: 2.xxv) has a table comparing Meleager’s series as discerned by Stadtmüller and Weißhäupl. The most up-to-date account is found in several tables appended in Gutzwiller (1998b: 325–32).

⁷³ On Meleagrian classifications, Cameron (1993: 26); in the Posidippus papyrus, Austin-Bastianini (2002: 21). Meleager seems to have included epigrams only of the erotic, epitaphic, dedicatory and epideictic classifications, though, as P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309 with its 10 different sub-genera now shows, ancient classifications could be multiplied; see Argentieri and Krevans in this volume.

textual apparatus, also offers the most comprehensive commentary on the literary epigrams up to the time of Meleager, but no English translation.

Gow and Page (1968) collect Greek literary epigram between 100 B.C. and ca. A.D. 40 (the assembly of Philip's *Stephanos*), although inclusion in the volumes is more selective, and the poems are also translated into English. But even with these two massive commentary editions, many literary epigrams from the fifth century B.C. down to 40 A.D., transmitted in *GA* and other sources—such as the so-called “Simonidean” epigrams, whose putative provenience extends from the fifth century B.C. on—were not included, either because they could not be demonstrated to have been included in Meleager's or Philip's *Stephanoi*, or because their ascription and provenience were and remain a mystery.⁷⁴ Page (1981) includes these and many other epigrams from the decades after the closing of Philip's *Stephanos* together with a textual apparatus and commentary; arrangement is on the same principles as in the 1965 and 1968 editions. Meanwhile, the barebones Page OCT (1975)—text and apparatus, divided by poet—contains most of the poems in the 1965, 1968 and 1981 editions. Two other, much smaller, and intentionally representative collections are also available: the epigrams included in Hopkinson (1988: 68–79, 243–71), a much-needed school and college level anthology of Hellenistic poetry; and Sens (forthcoming), a school and college level selection of Hellenistic epigram.

The availability of literary epigram in the format provided by Gow and Page has allowed scholars in the last forty years to work on epigram in a way that was earlier much more difficult. In addition, as interest in Hellenistic literature, culture, and history has grown in recent decades, information has come to light that has challenged long-held views about the literary culture of the age. As scholars have turned with new ideas to epigram, and as new areas of consensus have emerged, the need for up-dated scholarly editions of Hellenistic epigram has become apparent. Due to the arrangement in Gow-Page (1965) and (1968), scholars have come to see among other things the internal coherence of a single poet's epigrammatic *oeuvre*, a tack demonstrated most fully in Gutzwiller (1998b).⁷⁵

⁷⁴ See Sider in this volume.

⁷⁵ Editions of individual epigrammatists include: Anyte, Geoghegan (1979); Calli-

The validity of such an approach is borne out by the ample evidence of Hellenistic and imperial-era papyri—our third important source for epigrammatic texts, following inscriptions and manuscripts. These provide evidence of single-authored collections.⁷⁶ The verso of P.Petrie II 49a (= *SH* 961), for instance, dated to circa 250 B.C., has what appears to be a title, σύμμεικτα ἐπιγράμματα Ποσειδίπ[ου], *Miscellaneous Epigrams of Posidip[us]*, although what would be its opening poem is rather an elegiac epithalamium than an epigram.⁷⁷ Similarly attributed to Posidippus as [Ποσ]ειδιππου ἐπιγράμματα are two epigrams contained in P.Louvre 7172, 11 GP and 12 GP, on Pharos lighthouse and the Aphrodite-Arsinoe Temple at Zephyrium, respectively.⁷⁸ The most spectacular discovery, however, has been P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309, which came to light in the 1980s, and was finally published in 2001 and 2002.⁷⁹ This papyrus, comprising whole or fragmentary remains of 112 epigrams (some 600 verses), has re-energized the study of Hellenistic epigram. Out of this number, two poems were previously known, and attributed to Posidippus, 15 AB (= 20 GP = Tzetz. *Chil.* 7.660) and 65 AB (= 18 GP = *APL* 119). This has led to the scholarly consensus that all poems in the papyrus derive ultimately from his hand. Dated to the last quarter of the third century B.C., this text thus certainly provides evidence of epigram's early circulation, in collections, on papyrus, and

machus, Bentley (1761), von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1897), the still authoritative Pfeiffer (1949–53), and Pagonari-Antoniou with facing modern-Greek translations (1997); “Theocritus,” Rossi (2001); Posidippus, Schott (1905); Simias of Rhodes, Fränkel (1915); Asclepiades, Knauer (1935) and Guichard (2004); Dioscorides, Galán-Vioque (2001); Philodemus, Sider (1996); Leonidas of Tarentum in a school text by Clack (1999); and Mnasalces and Theodoridas, Seelbach (1964). Two further such editions are now in draft stages: Alexander Sens plans an edition of Asclepiades, and Kathryn Gutzwiller, an edition of Meleager.

⁷⁶ A fuller account of the papyrological evidence relevant to epigram, along with excellent bibliography, is available in Gutzwiller (1998b: 20–36); Cameron (1993: 5–14) also contains valuable information; and see Nisbet on Roman receptions, Krevans and Argentieri in this volume.

⁷⁷ There therefore remains some debate on just what the title's “epigrams” means—and how the term should be taken when, as Lloyd-Jones and Parsons (1983: 465), *ad loc.*, put it, the only poem, dated to 274 B.C., surviving on the papyrus “elegiam potius quam epigramma redoleat.” Gutzwiller (1998b: 15–36) generally expresses confidence that the term ἐπιγράμμα is, as early as the third century, of poems that we today call “epigrams”; Bruss (2005b: 7–10) argues that the poems so called are more likely “epigrams” in the sense of “metrical inscriptions;” see also Puelma (1996), and above, n. 47.

⁷⁸ Bibliography gathered at Austin and Bastianini (2002: 142, 144).

⁷⁹ Bastianini, Gallazzi, and Austin (2001) and Austin and Bastianini (2002).

possibly of single-authored, or even author-edited, volumes.⁸⁰ In addition, the papyrus has transformed our understanding of epigrammatic typologies, providing us with a “new” set of categories, and helping us understand principles of arrangement. Above all, perhaps, it has shown how selective and partial our picture of Hellenistic epigram had been, as transmitted by Meleager and *GA*. Fundamental aspects in our understanding of the field are thus currently changing. At such a pivotal moment in epigram studies, we hope that this Brill’s Companion will offer a critical resource, and help advance the current reassessment of this multifaceted genre.

⁸⁰ On the papyrus, see, principally, Bastianini (2002), Bastianini and Casanova (2002), Acosta-Hughes, Kosmetatou and Baumbach (2004), Gutzwiller (2005c), and Di Marco, Palumbo Stracca and Lelli (2005).

PART ONE

MODELS AND FORM

POEMS ON STONE:
THE INSCRIBED ANTECEDENTS OF
HELLENISTIC EPIGRAM

Joseph W. Day

Consideration of the inscribed epigram's relationship to the object it accompanies must be central in any investigation of its form, meaning, and function in historical context.¹ My colleagues who study Hellenistic epideictic epigrams show how even their authors exploited readers' expectations concerning this relationship for literary effect.² Still, simply recognizing the relationship's importance leaves much room for disagreement about its nature and, in general, our understanding of inscribed epigrams, especially the typically brief and formulaic texts of the archaic and earlier classical periods which do not exhibit the expansion and ecphrasis characteristic of later eras.³

Especially intense scholarly disagreement has arisen over the (nearly) contemporary reception of inscribed epigrams, that is, the responses of their earliest readers, who were also viewers of the inscribed objects. Some question the project's validity, arguing that, at least before the fourth-century spread of literacy, inscriptions were not widely read.⁴ Others accept more wide-spread reading, even in archaic Greece;⁵ but they hardly agree about how people actually experienced reading while viewing. One's approach to the reception of epigram and inscribed object often mirrors one's answer to the question: Are epigrams poems?

¹ See Häusle (1979a: 88–105), Raubitschek (1968: 3), both cited by Gutzwiller (1998b: 3, n. 7).

² E.g., Bing (1995b), Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 283–349), Kosmetatou (2004c) and (2004b).

³ Keesling (2003b: 16–21) discusses “disjunctive representation” in archaic Athenian inscriptions for statue dedications: they avoid identifying the images or describing them in detail. For epitaphs and funerary portraits, see Day (1989: 20–1, with n. 39). For epigrams as descriptive labels on works of art, see Elmer (2005); however, though many may have perished with wall paintings and textiles, they do not now constitute a major genre. See also, Bruss (forthcoming).

⁴ See Bing (2002b), Thomas (1995), with their references to other studies.

⁵ One argument emphasizes aids to legibility in inscriptions; see Keesling (2003b), Perlman (2004).

I answer in the positive, but only by accepting a functional definition of poetry alongside a more conventional aesthetic one: poetry was a traditional form of both effective social performance and verbal artistry. With an understanding of such features of earlier Greek poetic performance as traditional referentiality and framing, we can reconstruct ancient readings of epigrams more comprehensively and limit the effects of circular argumentation inherent in seeking clues to epigrams' reception in the texts themselves.

Epigrams obviously adopt poetic forms of meter, rhetoric, and phraseology; but insofar as they are conceived of as texts, that is, as literary objects read for serious consideration of their content or for effect (including aesthetic appreciation), opinion about their relationship to poetry in any deeper sense is split.⁶ Some epigrams exhibit greater formal quality than others, and that quality may have had an impact on readers.⁷ Furthermore, we find some fine inscribed poetry exhibiting an originality and emotional appeal that suggest professional authorship, especially in publicly sponsored epigrams like that on the cenotaph at Ambracia (*SEG* 41.540A):⁸

Ἄνδρας [τ]ούσδ' [ἐ]σλοὺς ὀλοφύρομαι, ἡοῖσι Πυραιβὼν :
παῖδες ἐμετίσαντ' ἄ[λ]κινόμεντα φόνον, :
ἀνγε[λί]αν μετ'ιόντας ἅπ' εὐρυχόροι[ο] Φορίνθου :]

[missing pentameter and hexameter, ?with the names of the
Corinthian ambassadors]

5

πατρίδ' ἀν' ἱμερτὰν πένθος ἔθαλλε τότε. :
Τόδε δ' ἅπ' Ἀνπρακίας, Ναυσίστρατο<ν>, αὐτὰ παθόντε, :
Καλλίταν τ' Αἶδα δόμα μέλαν κατέχευε. :
κα|Ἐ μὲν Ἀραθθίονα καὶ Ἐϋξενον ἔστε, πολῖταε, :
ἥος μετὰ τὸνδ' ἀνδρὼν Κὰρ ἔκιχεν θανάτου. :

10

⁶ For poetic forms in, e.g., archaic epitaphs, see Day (1989), Derderian (2001: 86–93), Di Tillio (1969), Ecker (1990), Gentili (1968); but for inscribed epigram's general lack of poetic allusion, see n. 29 below. For “texts,” see Ford (2003), Gutzwiller (1998b: 47).

⁷ Lougovaya (2004: 53–6, 60–74) argues that, in sixth-century Attic epitaphs, metrical competence and other aspects of poetic quality effectively projected a status claim through the display of poetic culture.

⁸ “Ca. 550 B.C. or somewhat later,” *SEG*. My text follows Cassio (1994: 103) and D'Alessio (1995a: 26). See also *SEG* 44.463, 45.661, 46.676, Bousquet (1992). The break between lines 1 and 2 falls in the lacuna. “E” in verses 8–9 (except in Εϋξενον) represents an epichoric Corinthian vowel in that form, as opposed to angular “B” (which renders the sounds represented by epsilon and eta in the Ionic alphabet); for the vowel's quality, see Cassio (1994: 104), Wachter (2001: 243–8). See also n. 43 below.

I lament these brave men, for whom, as they accompanied an embassy from [Corinth] of the wide dancing places, the sons of the Pyraebi devised a grievous slaughter... then in (their) beloved fatherland grief blossomed. And these two from Ambracia, Nausistratus and Callitas, having suffered the same fate, the dark house of Hades confines. And—here!—know, citizens, that the Ker of death overtook Aratthion and Euxenus together with these men.

Features of this poem's artistry include its unusual length, carefully planned structure exemplified in the identical scansion of the first and last distichs, and echoes of elegy in both form (first-person verb of lament, direct address to audience) and content (honor for the fallen and emotional language—lament, grief's bloom in the beloved fatherland, ill fate, dark Hades, the Ker of death).⁹ Sympathetic readers could admire the poem's quality and, taking its message to heart, feel pity for the deceased and thereby replicate the grief that blossomed in Corinth. When such a reader read out ὀλοφύρομαι (I lament), a feeling actually experienced was named. The emotion might strike more sharply as readers reflected that Hades and the Ker awaited them too.¹⁰

The Ambracia poem, however, had little company in the first three centuries of Greek epigram. Many texts, especially when read against numerous others exhibiting the same formulas (often from the same sanctuaries or cemeteries), seem to be versified tags for the objects they accompany. Even formally competent inscriptions were generally objects of craft rather than true poetry, contributing not to an inscribed object's artistry, but to its μνήμα (memorial) function by conveying basic information like names and a person's accomplishment or manner of death.¹¹ Earlier epigrams lack marks of literariness that begin in the fourth century, for example, self-awareness of themselves as poetic texts (composers' signatures, references to nearby inscriptions¹²) and aspects of the poeticity typical of inscribed and literary epigrams in

⁹ Cassio (1994), Lougovaya (2004: 68–74). For the scansion and other evidence “di regolarità quasi maniacale,” see Cassio (1994: 105–6).

¹⁰ *CEG* 34 is explicit: ... ἐπεὶ καὶ σὲ μένει θάνατος.

¹¹ See Gutzwiller (1998b: 2–11, 47–52), who notes that quoting and copying epigrams as aesthetic objects began in the late fifth century, though Pindar effectively quotes *CEG* 2 at *P* 1.74–5. For μνήμα function, see Keesling (2003b: 199). For “subliterary” inscribed epigrams, see Bing (1998: 38 with n. 54).

¹² For the former, see *CEG* 819, 888.ii; for the latter, e.g., *CEG* 795 with Löhr (2000: no. 139), Kosmetatou (2004b: 234–41).

later periods (detailed ecphrasis, use of aphorisms¹³). If earlier Greeks did not often take epigrams seriously as poetic texts, however, they may still have conceived of them as poems, but in a functional rather than a literary or aesthetic sense.

Earlier epigrams, with most early inscriptions, should be interpreted in terms of performance. Epigrams build the evidence of performance into their grammar: from the ubiquitous *Ich-rede* of older dedications (“So-and-so dedicated me”) to the complex deictics at Ambracia (“these men . . . I . . . o citizens”), they are phrased as moves in speech situations. They are also texts, and epigram became popular as poets like Sappho were exploring the possibilities of poems as texts.¹⁴ However, poetry was predominantly a performance medium. Therefore, we should not be surprised that verse inscriptions stand at the head of writing in many Greek areas and that verse was long employed for all but the most minimal funerary and dedicatory inscriptions, when we consider the close relationship between inscription and performance. As several scholars have argued, inscriptions fixed performed speech in a permanent medium, though not necessarily as a literal record: writing symbolized performance, even became a kind of performance, so that it assumed performance’s authoritative efficacy.¹⁵ Others, myself included, focus on the vocal reading of inscriptions and construe epigraphic performance more literally, suggesting parallels between read epigram and oral, performed, occasional poetry. Svenbro, despite problems with his use of epigraphic evidence and a lack of early ancient descriptions of people reading inscriptions, articulates the situation of reading usefully: a reader utters the inscription aloud, providing the performance’s voice; the reader and others present hear the words. Inscriptions functioned as scripts; epigrams were experienced as poetry normally would be, as performed speech.¹⁶ Epigraphic audiences, though, were also viewers of a monument, work of art, or other object; and this fact allows us to reconstruct the relationship between epigram and object in interesting ways.

¹³ For the latter, see Labarbe (1968b); Christos Tsagalis is studying proverbs in fourth-century epitaphs.

¹⁴ Stehle (1997: 288–318).

¹⁵ Osborne (1999), Steiner (1994: 61–99), Thomas (1992: 56–100), and differently, Papalexandrou (2005: 86).

¹⁶ Svenbro (1993: 8–63). See also Day (2000: 43–5), Häusle (1979a: 100–3); *contra* Bing (2002b), Gutzwiller (1998b: 2–3, 11).

Papalexandrou sees the essential feature of inscribed epigram and its literary imitations as their guidance of the way a work of art is viewed.¹⁷ He notes that “the communicative efficacy of the monument depends on the simultaneous viewing of image and poetry, of the visual and the aural,” and that the “epigrammatist’s voice dictates the perceptual terms that guide our gaze.” However, he is thinking primarily of literary epigrammatists, and he cites studies of *ecphrasis* in Hellenistic epigram.¹⁸ These epigrams focus on a reader’s personal aesthetic and interpretive response, which is guided into a sophisticated dialectic about art and its appreciation and interpretation; and the epigrams’ polish and learning, even ironic distancing, contribute to the conversation.

While earlier inscribed epigrams guided the emotional responses of viewers, too, they were generally displayed on objects seen by the public in sanctuaries or cemeteries, often beside roads, even in agoras. Not surprisingly, they echo in content and phraseology the authoritative, socially constitutive poetry performed on civic or otherwise communal occasions, and they guide responses along collective lines shaped by culturally dominant values and tastes.¹⁹ Tanner says this about epigrams on dedicated statues of athletic victors:²⁰

In reading and speaking the poem . . . , [t]he viewer is the mouthpiece of collective memory, ritually enacting and renewing shared understanding of the meaning of athletic victory presupposed in the dedication of the statue itself, rather than exploring an individuated response to the statue as an object of aesthetic interest. . . . Preservation of collective memory is at the cost of the autonomy of the viewer-reader, whose own individuality is submerged in the poem he enacts, and at the cost of the independent voices of the poet and the artist,²¹ who remain lost in anonymity.

Tanner calls the inscription “a framing device” that serves to “shape the relationship constructed between the viewer and the work of art,” a process he conceptualizes in terms of performance, at least for epigrams: they “were not simply read but rather performed by the viewer.” Tanner’s analysis is consistent with recent thinking about oral performance in early Greece, where poetry memorialized by means of

¹⁷ Papalexandrou (2004: 251, 254 for the quotations).

¹⁸ Goldhill (1994), Kosmetatou (2004c); compare Gutzwiller (1998b: 13).

¹⁹ Compare Bing (1995b: 115).

²⁰ Tanner (1999: 158–64).

²¹ The prominence of archaic artists’ signatures demands qualification of this point.

traditional referentiality or thematization, that is, by placing the subject in a familiar poetic/cultural category. By calling up the themes in audiences' minds through economical, connotative language, performers made their subjects present in performance: they enacted characters and events rather than merely representing or narrating them.²² With the concepts of performance framing and thematization, and an appreciation of their performative effects, we can better explore the relationship between epigram and inscribed object at the level of reception.

Epigrams certainly locate their subjects in poetically and culturally important categories (social, religious, political, ritual, etc.), but these are few, unspecific, and thus quite limiting. Most verse epitaphs and the iconography of their grave markers place the deceased in a narrow range of types corresponding to important cultural and poetic categories: the commonest are the most pitiful, namely, the young who die before marriage (including young warriors, the poetic theme of "beautiful death").²³ Corresponding to the wider variety of dedications, dedicatory epigrams exhibit a wider, but still limited, range of categories for the dedicator's achievement (athletic, military, economic, political), the ritual mechanism²⁴ (tithe, firstfruits, vow fulfillment, foundation of a cult site like an altar, offering of crowns), and locally important aspects of the divine recipient.²⁵ In addition, most of the persons commemorated belonged to an élite and the cultural categories reflect élite ideology: monuments and epigrams make status claims and function as sites for the negotiation of social order when they are read and viewed.²⁶

The limitations imposed on archaic and earlier classical epigrams insure that most of them are more mechanically formulaic and less varied, original, and interesting as poetic texts than later inscribed and especially literary epigram.²⁷ These limitations are consistent with the

²² See Bakker (1993, 1997: 74–6, 162–63), who builds on Foley's concept of traditional referentiality. For that term applied to epigrams, see Derderian (2001: 7–8 and *passim*), citing Foley (1991: 7–10 and *passim*). Compare Depew (2000: 72–4), Sourvinou-Inwood (1995: 362–412).

²³ See Griessmair (1966), Sourvinou-Inwood (1995: 221–94), Keesling (2003b: 91), and n. 6 above.

²⁴ See Keesling (2003b: 4–10).

²⁵ Day (1994: 46–54) argues that naming formulas for Athena on dedications from the Athenian Acropolis characterize her as goddess of the Panathenaea.

²⁶ See Lougovaya (2004: 2, 209, *passim*), Sourvinou-Inwood (1995: 170–2), and at n. 37 below.

²⁷ The growth of family concerns in inscribed epigram provides an example of the expansion of limits in changed cultural contexts from the late fifth century. Family

epigrams' social efficacy, that is, their public function of framing the viewing of monuments within the culturally homogeneous and communally-oriented contexts of cemetery, sanctuary, and polis. Epigrams' poetic quality and originality, however, were not so important: those features in the Ambracia epigram might contribute much to the monument's efficacy, but in most cases viewing a monument or work of art generated most of the effect. A simple, formulaic epigram might play only a humble framing role in the combined performance of reading while viewing; but the role was so characteristic of, and so functionally important in, performed poetry that we can perhaps find here a reason for the use of verse in inscriptions that hardly seem "poetic." Moreover, if epigrams frame readings and viewings by locating their subjects in traditional categories, they also do so by thematizing the combined performance itself in a poetic manner, and this is the subject of the rest of the paper.

Poetry was performed for effect on specific occasions, and traces of the occasions appear in poems, both descriptions of the events and verbal mechanisms for achieving the events' communicative goals. We should therefore not be surprised if verse written on an object points toward a kind of occasion familiar to a Greek audience, and if the object itself has corresponding ceremonial associations. An epigram fixes such an occasion (or its results) in writing and provides a script for its enactment in reading, which is typically presented as an original occasion's reenactment.²⁸ Such thinking has been applied to many among that high percentage of the earliest alphabetic inscriptions that are metrical. For example, the Dipylon wine jug was probably awarded as a prize in a dancing contest during a symposium (*CEG* 432, Athens, ca. 740):²⁹

was always important (Kosmetatou (2004b: 233–4)), though democratic ideology could mute that importance; but for changes, see Breuer (1995), Keesling (2003b: 165–98), Lougovaya (2004: 149–57), and also Löhr (2000).

²⁸ See nn. 15 and 16 above. See also Day (1989) and (1994). Greeks phrased inscriptions to fix "what the person or group setting up the image was doing in setting it up," and this, so Tanner (1999: 158, 161), suggests they believed that the original communicative process was "rehearsed" in encounters with the monument.

²⁹ Henrichs (1996: 32–5) and (2003: 45–6), Powell (1991: 158–63), Robb (1994: 21–43). For poetic allusion in this epigram and *CEG* 454 on "Nestor's cup," see Bing (2007) and Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 283–8), who, however, see such "literary" sophistication in these graffiti as exceptional and alien to formally inscribed sepulchral and dedicatory epigram.

hòς νῦν ὀρχεστὸν πάντων ἀταλότατα παίζει,
τῷ τόδε...

Whoever of all the dancers now sports (or dances) most playfully, this
(sc. jug) [?will be] his...

The words echo the announcement of a prize before a contest, like those Achilles utters in *Iliad* 23.³⁰ The winner was evidently proud of the prize, as it was taken to the grave. Perhaps in the owner's life, whenever the jug was displayed and used in subsequent symposia, someone read the words out and successfully framed the new interaction with the pitcher as effectively like the original: the glory of the owner's victory was (re)enacted during the new (?playful) event.

We can approach similarly epigrams on athletes' dedications. They regularly feature four pieces of information that constituted the elements of the herald's announcement during the crowning ceremony: the victor's name, his father's name, city, and event (e.g., *CEG* 362, 381, 383, and probably 389, 393, and 398). As people read such epigrams, that ceremonial occasion, or its effect among an admiring audience, was repeated. This conclusion is supported by fourth-century epigrams like *CEG* 827 (Olympia, bronze plaque for statue base, ca. 300):³¹

ὦδε στάς...	1
ᾧμος ἐκαρύχθη νικαφόρος. ἀλλά, πάτερ Ζεῦ,	3

³⁰ Lines 660–2, 667, 707, 753=831, 805–8, 855–8. Five letters or attempted letters follow τόδε; see *CEG* commentary, Powell (1991: 159–60), *SEG* 43.10. There is no generally accepted interpretation of them; and the inscriber seems to have given up after this attempt (if it is one) to proceed beyond the initial dactyl of a second hexameter. Still, readers who uttered just as much of the inscription as we can decipher would complete the announcement of the prize.

³¹ For this epigram and, in general, the echoes of the formal elements of the herald's announcement in athletic epigram (and epinician poetry), see Day (1994: 63–71), Kurke (1993: 141–9), Steiner (1993), Tanner (1999: 161–4). Compare *CEG* 823, 844.7–9, also 632.5–6, Ebert (1972: nos. 56, 67 (= *AP* 9.588)). Although a herald's utterance is named in *CEG* 827, it is not fully reproduced: the epigram lacks the victor's patronymic and polis (though his ethnic is highlighted). Perhaps the lost stone base carried a plain version of the announcement in a prose inscription; compare Ebert (1972: 167). Epigrams can, however, simply omit elements of the announcement, sometimes for obvious reasons: in the victor's hometown, as opposed to a panhellenic game site, the polis can be omitted (e.g., *CEG* 364). Serious problems about *CEG* 827 remain unresolved, because Paus. 6.8.5 reports a statue of an Arcadian Philippus at Olympia, but attributes it to Myron, apparently the fifth-century sculptor. Hansen (at *CEG* 827) and Ebert (1972: no. 55), however, have laid to rest the older hypothesis that the epigram celebrates two individuals, the boxer of the first lines and (?another) Philippus in the last lines.

καὶ πάλιν Ἀρκαδίαι καλὸν ἄμειβε κλέος, | 4
τίμασον δὲ Φίλιππον...

Standing just so (Philippus demonstrated his boxing skills), when he was heralded victor. But also again, father Zeus, return beautiful glory to Arcadia, and honor Philippus...

This epigram, with its self-consciousness as a descriptive label (“standing just so...”) that associates the perpetuation of an earlier event (“he was heralded”) with both viewing a statue of the victor just so in his ceremonial moment and reading prayers for benefits “again” to victor and fatherland, is not typical of earlier epigrams. Still, it makes explicit the way those epigrams, with echoes of the announcement, guided encounters with monuments by framing them as (reenacted) victory ceremonies, as epinician poems framed their performances. As Kurke says,

...the combination of epigram and victor statue elicited from its beholder a perfect re-creation of the original announcement and coronation. As the viewer lent his voice to the epigram that reconstructed the victory announcement, he stood in the position of the Hellanodikas and crowned the victor with his gaze.³²

Most archaic and earlier classical epigrams are dedicatory or funerary,³³ and they point to relevant occasions. Dedications narrate the ritual of offering (“So-and-so dedicated...”); but they also often contain proximate deictics (“...dedicated me” or “this object”) and direct address to the god (vocative naming formulas or prayers to accept the offering or return the favor). Readers thus framed their performance as like the original ritual. Indeed, readings were performative: every reader was co-opted into offering the dedication anew, effectively recharging the original act in language that echoes self-referential passages in hymns where singers dedicate their performance to the god.³⁴ I provide examples later.

³² Kurke (1993: 145).

³³ Commemorative monuments, neither dedicatory nor funerary, could carry epigrams, e.g., that of the Tyrannicides (*CEG* 430); see Lougovaya (2004: 92–112). Honorific portrait statues, which became increasingly popular from the fourth century, are related, but many, perhaps most, were dedications and are so classified in epigraphic collections (following *Inscriptiones Graecae*). The epigraphic formula changed, but was still generally dedicatory; see Keesling (2003b: 167), but compare McLean (2002: 236).

³⁴ Day (1994: 55–63, 2000), Depew (2000).

Verse epitaphs, too, represent an original ritual, sometimes literally (*CEG* 14 = *GVI* 159): "...his father erected this marker as he lamented (ὄλοφύρομενος)." The representation of ritual (or performance) may consist in echoes of poetic lament,³⁵ although the generic source of the poetic echoes, and therefore the kind of occasion framed and (re)enacted, are contested.³⁶ Cassio argues that the Ambracia epigram echoes funerary elegy or threnody in its elegiac features, especially the first-person ὄλοφύρομαι (I lament), which he sees as anonymous and deictically open: every reader became the script's performer, reenacting the men's funeral with words. Lougovaya disagrees: the "I" is not open as it fixes the voice of the monument or the chief mourner, and the epigram reflects consolatory or commemorative sympotic elegy, not threnody. Whatever the generic source, the epigram associates itself with a familiar kind of occasional performance and, I believe, frames vocal readings as such an occasion, though for Lougovaya readings are not explicitly framed as new performances because the first-person deixis is not truly open.

Was framing in epigrams more than purely formal? Is the idea of effective performance really applicable here? Performances can be powerful things socially, religiously, politically, aesthetically; audiences' responses are unpredictable, and authorities often try to exert control. To be sure, the performances I envisage for epigrams would often be very small-scale affairs, perhaps involving only one person. Nevertheless, monuments and their inscriptions sometimes became sites of serious social negotiation,³⁷ and appreciation of the linkage between monument and epigram helps us understand why: considerable power could be generated in the combined performance of viewing an object (often a work of art) while reading (or hearing) its inscription. I present one example of how powerful the complementary effects of viewing and reading could be, and then I discuss ways that in that case, but also

³⁵ Day (1989); *contra* Sourvinou-Inwood (1995: 119, n. 34, 174, n. 277).

³⁶ See Cassio (1994) and Lougovaya (2004: 68–73), both reviewing earlier scholarship. For Derderian (2001: 63–113), verse epitaphs thematize the inscribed monument as an extension of lament's efficacy, closer in efficacy to epic performance than lamentation.

³⁷ E.g., the serpent column at Delphi (Simonides 17a *FGE*) and the Eion Herms in the Athenian Agora (Simonides 40 *FGE*). See Steiner (2001: 265–71), and, for cities' efforts to frame as civic elite citizens' private dedications at Delphi, Neer (2001) and (2004).

more typically, an epigram could successfully frame the performance by thematizing its effects.

Viewing the Ambracia cenotaph and reading its epigram likely produced strong, complementary responses. We do not know what, if anything, stood atop the wall,³⁸ but we can reconstruct something of the monument's visual impact. Both its location (on a street between port and city) and its monumentality (2.50m high and 12.40m long) project an air of civic importance and authority. So also does the inscription's monumentality, with 0.06m high letters running almost the length of the wall in nearly two and a half lines,³⁹ displayed in their own space above a horizontal torus molding that separates the inscription from the wall's undecorated face. As a poem, too, the epigram is monumental, a full five distichs; and it verbalizes the civic importance of the object as a memorial of leading men killed in a military catastrophe to polis and metropolis. It even addresses itself to the citizen body. The same message of importance and authority is conveyed by the monument's quality as a fine limestone wall of ashlar blocks with a molding all around. The inscription's quality reinforces that message: "Les lettres, magnifiques et très régulières... la remarquable organisation graphique" in visually pleasing stoichedon (letters in vertical rows).⁴⁰ The epigram's poetic qualities⁴¹ would elicit the same kind of admiring response from readers that the visual qualities would from viewers. In addition, the elegiac characteristics and historical content could channel that admiration into an emotionally heightened and engaged response, pain for Ambracia's loss of such high quality men and a repetition of the grief that bloomed in Corinth. The ensemble's monumentality produces a complementary physical engagement for readers: they are co-opted into replicating the movement of the boustrophedon inscription, walking twelve meters ahead in reading the first line, turning and moving back twelve meters to read the retrograde second line, and finally forward

³⁸ One stele, with a second epigram, was found, but its relationship to the cenotaph is disputed; see *SEG* 41.540, 45.661. Names in this epigram and any others now lost could have supplied the referents of τοῦσδε in line 1.

³⁹ Bousquet (1992: 604) calculates it was *hekatompedos*, 100 feet (29.74m) long.

⁴⁰ Bousquet (1992: 597, 604). Stoichedon and line length preclude agreement of the ends of words and verses with line-ends; but triple-dot punctuation at verse-ends facilitates metrical reading. For epigraphic aesthetics, see Häusle (1979a: 88–105), Keesling (2003b: 220, n. 29, 2003a).

⁴¹ See n. 9 above.

again six more meters with the third. Their movement makes the epigram's message theirs physically, even as their responses to the words would do so cognitively and emotionally. Readers, hearers, and viewers, in their acts and responses, performed a lament or commemorative ritual for a communal tragedy. Their motion might even replicate a processional ritual, or perhaps a choral performance with its back and forth motion of strophe/antistrophe, at the monument's founding.⁴²

For Cassio, every reader, assuming the voice of an authoritative performer before a citizen audience, named the kind of performance and its intended effect in the first verse, ὀλοφύρομαι (I lament). The word is normal Greek, but its orthography (presumably reflecting its phonology) is not local: it reflects Ionic spelling and poetic tradition.⁴³ The word thematized readers' and viewers' acts and responses by calling to any poetically experienced hearer's mind a familiar set of connotations and the contexts in which it had been encountered in the poetry of lament, consolation, commemoration, or the like.⁴⁴ It framed the encounter with the monument as such a performance. To the extent emotional heightening was achieved, the framing would seem successful: ὀλοφύρομαι would be heard as literally performative, naming the effects that the utterance generated (in tandem with viewing the monument).

CEG 51 frames the encounter similarly, though with a different verb, and it focuses our attention on the object's visual impact (Cericus, ca. 510):⁴⁵

οἰκτίρο προσορῶ[v] | παιδὸς τόδε σῆμα | θανόντος :
Σμικύθ[o] | ἥος τε φίλον ὄλεσε | v ἔλπ' ἀγαθέν.

I grieve in pity as I look upon this grave-marker of the boy who died,
Smicythus, who destroyed the good hope of his dear ones.

Another epitaph makes the framing verb imperative and is more explicit about the nature of the visual impact (*CEG* 68 = *GVI* 1223, Attica, ca. 500):

⁴² Compare Davies (2000: 120–35); Elizabeth McGowan is applying such approaches to Greek material.

⁴³ Cassio (1994: 104). In local spelling, the last letter would be E; see n. 8 above.

⁴⁴ Day (1989: 25 with n. 69, 27 with n. 77); compare Sourvinou-Inwood (1995: 170–9).

⁴⁵ Compare *CEG* 28, 470; see also 19, 46, *AP* 7.511 (= Simonides 75 *FGE*), with Cassio (1994: 112), Ecker (1990: 149–67).

παι[δὸς] [ἀπ]οφθιμένοιο Κλ[εοί]το τὸ Μεν|εσαίχμο :
 μνῆμ' ἐσορὸν οἴκτιρ' ὅς καλὸς | ὃν ἔθανε.

As you look upon the memorial of the perished boy, Cleoetes son of Menesaechmus, grieve in pity! He died ?though he was (so) beautiful.

Both epigrams were inscribed on the bases of stelai, now lost, but likely decorated with relief or painted images of youths. Comparable epitaphs, which do not however explicitly mention viewing, also accompanied stelai or statues of youths (*kouroi*).⁴⁶ As poems, these epitaphs convey the pathos of youthful death in conventional terms and with flashes of originality. They also frame the encounter with the monument in the same way a lament or commemorative song performed for the beautiful dead might be framed, with direct address to the audience requesting a certain response, or with open first-persons that forced speakers (and allowed audiences, vicariously⁴⁷) to name their response. However, the epigrams that mention viewing make the viewer's gaze, not the reader's voice, the source of the emotionally heightened response; and various plausible aesthetic responses to the iconography show how that framing might succeed. For example, the beauty of the (at least partly) nude figures could generate an erotic response of desire (mixed with admiration) and through it a consequent amplification of grief or pity for what was lost.⁴⁸ Insofar as viewers' responses matched the frame—desire, sad sense of loss, pity—the framing was successful: effects came about as cued.

Such framing is consistent with the technical definition of framing that Depew adopts from performance theory. In pointing out verbal similarities between performance framing in hymns and the presentation of the dedication and act of dedicating in epigrams, she shows that performers framed their song as an offering to the god with two forms of self-presentation. First, they put on display their activities' social efficacy in generating communicative interaction with human and divine audiences; and second, they highlighted the beauty and artistry by which their performance produced those effects through emotional heightening. They marked performances in this way as special kinds

⁴⁶ For the former, *CEG* 13, possibly 471; for the latter, 27, 34; perhaps with both, 43. See also 117, 148, 159, 174. For references to images, see Day (1989: 21–2).

⁴⁷ Depew (2000: 72).

⁴⁸ Neer (1995), Steiner (2001: 185–250, esp. 212–8), Stewart (1997: 63–7), also Lougovaya (2004: 30–1, 47).

of activity, in effect ritualizing them.⁴⁹ Such double framing is nearly explicit in *CEG* 68, which invites passersby to grieve for the beautiful youth upon viewing what is all but labeled a correspondingly beautiful image.

I end with a bolder suggestion about epigraphic performance framing. The word ἄγαλμα is a ubiquitous name for the dedication, as in *CEG* 363 with perhaps the oldest instance of its use (bronze aryballus, ?Sparta, ca. 600):

Χαλκοδάμανς με ἀνέθηκε θιοῖν περικαλλές ἄγαλμα.

Chalcodamas dedicated me to the two gods,⁵⁰ a very beautiful ἄγαλμα.

The word is often dismissed as a forceless term meaning “dedication,” here in a line-end lifted from epic (e.g., *Od.* 18.300). However, its meaning and use in poetry, its parallel contexts and evidently similar sense in epigrams, and its near absence from prose inscriptions suggest that the word was intended to function as a poetic double frame presenting the artistry of the dedication and its social (or religious) effects. And the frame could well succeed.

I cannot explore the term ἄγαλμα extensively here,⁵¹ but in earlier Greek poetry it designates a richly crafted, beautiful, valuable object that produces delight and exaltation and, by means of those responses, mediates friendly and lasting, though often ranked, relationships. Ἀγάλματα typically work their effects in ceremonial occasions, and the relationships generated include marriage,⁵² guest friendship,⁵³ sympotic solidarity,⁵⁴ and especially religious ties between gods and people. In *Odyssey* 3, for example, amid a scene of sacrifice... (lines 435–438):⁵⁵

⁴⁹ Depew (2000: esp. 59–60) thinks of framing in verbal artistry, for which see Bauman (1975: esp. 292–6). For framing in ritual and “ritualization,” see Bell (1997: 72–83, 160) and Kurke (2005), whose approach reflects practice rather than performance theory. Day (2000) explores dedicatory epigrams from the compatible perspective of genre cueing.

⁵⁰ Likely the Dioscuri; Jeffery (1990: 156).

⁵¹ As I shall in a monograph, *Epigram and Reader*. See Keesling (2003b: 10), Scheer (2000: 8–18), Steiner (1994: 61–99), who cite earlier studies.

⁵² E.g., *Od.* 18.300; compare 19.257 (wife’s gift to husband on unspecified occasion) and, for Pandora “glorying and delighting” (ἀγαλλομένην; see n. 57 below) in her ornament, Hes. *Th.* 587.

⁵³ E.g., *Od.* 4.602, and the gift-song at Bacch. 5.4.

⁵⁴ E.g., the gift-song at Bacch. fr. 20B.5.

⁵⁵ Compare, e.g., *Od.* 3.274, 8.509, 12.347, *h.H.Bacch.* 1.D1 (West (2001: esp. 8)), Stesich. S88.ii.10, Pind. *N.* 8.16 (quoted below).

ἦλθε δ' Ἀθήνη
 ἱρῶν ἀντιόωσα. γέρων δ' ἱππηλάτα Νέστωρ
 χρυσὸν ἔδωχ'· ὁ δ' ἔπειτα βοὸς κέρασιν περίχευεν
 ἀσκήσας, ἴν' ἄγαλμα θεὰ κεχάροιτο ἰδοῦσα.

Athena came to accept the offering. The old man, horse-driving Nestor gave gold; and then [the smith] worked it and poured it about the heifer's horns, so that the goddess might look at the ἄγαλμα and rejoice (verb χαίρω).

Joyful contact between god and worshipper is generated by offering a heifer with skillfully gilded horns—an ἄγαλμα—for the god to see.

By calling something an ἄγαλμα, then, one makes claims about its beauty or artistry and the social effects generated in emotionally heightened responses to it. The term is well-suited to performance frames in poetry, as in a hymn-like passage in Pindar's *Nemean* 8 (lines 13–16):

ἱκέτας Αἰακοῦ σεμνῶν γονάτων πόλιός θ' ὑπὲρ φίλας
 ἀστῶν θ' ὑπὲρ τῶνδ' ἄπτομαι φέρων
 Λυδῖαν μίτραν καναχηδὰ πεποικιλμέναν,
 Δεινίος δισσῶν σταδίων καὶ πατρὸς Μέγα Νεμεαῖον ἄγαλμα.

A suppliant, I clasp Aeacus' holy knees, on behalf of his dear city and these citizens, as I bear (in offering) a Lydian headband, variegated with shrill sounds, a Nemean ἄγαλμα of the two-stade races of Deinias and his father Megas.

This headband, with its “shrill sounds” (flute music), symbolizes the ode in performance. Performers would proclaim the occasion a ritual of offering⁵⁶ and the song itself a dedication that is an ἄγαλμα, a thing which, through its joy-causing artistry, could persuade the hero to come to the celebration.⁵⁷ If a performance generated a heightened experience of joy for its audience, they would perceive the frame as

⁵⁶ Which it literally was, since the victor's headband was offered as well as the song figuratively merged with it; see Nisetich (1975: 61–2), with Kurke (1993: 137–41), Steiner (1993: 164–5).

⁵⁷ Ἀγάλματα also appear in performance frames at Pind. *N.* 3.13, Bacch. 5.4, 10.11, 20B.5, and perhaps 1.184; see also Steiner (1993) and (1994: 91–9). At *N.* 5.1–5, Pindar sets himself off from makers of ἀγάλματα, but see Steiner (1993: 159–64). The ἀγλα- family of words is probably not related to the ἄγαλ-, one, but was considered so, and the two were used in similar contexts and carried similar connotations; for the former in performance frames comparable to *N.* 8, see Pind. fr. 75.7–8, Bacch. 3.1–22 with Harrell (1998), also Pind. *O.* 3.6, *P.* 12.1; compare *O.* 8.11, *P.* 5.52, *N.* 11.4, *Pa.* 3.1–5, *Parth.* 2.7, fr. 215a.10, Bacch. 29 (fr. c), fr. 4.56, *PMG* 851b. *CEG* 429 defines dedicating an ἄγαλμα as conferring ἀγλαΐα on the nearby altar; compare 770 (conferring ἀγλαΐα [ἐπαγλαΐζω] as verb of dedication, without ἄγαλμα).

successful, certainly at the aesthetic level, perhaps at the religious one: the hero could seem present, enjoying his beautiful gift along with the audience.⁵⁸

Epigrams offer only limited possibilities for variation in syntax and word order; but, in comparison with other common names for the dedication, ἄγαλμα's strikingly closer association with certain patterns of syntax and word order suggests the word's epigraphic meaning mirrors its traditional poetic one.⁵⁹ Even in longer epigrams, ἄγαλμα typically appears, not in additions like participial phrases or relative clauses, but in the texts' syntactical core, that is, the main clause that articulates the rite of dedication, typically comes first, and alone constitutes one-liners like *CEG* 363: "Chalcodamas dedicated me to the two gods, a very beautiful ἄγαλμα." Usage (with or without "me") thus points to a meaning that is functional: a ritual medium by which a dedicator seeks to foster a relationship with a god. An adjective like "(very) beautiful" makes explicit the source of the ἄγαλμα-medium's efficacy; but even without it, epigraphic ἄγαλμα in this context likely activated in readers' minds the word's poetic connotations, thereby thematizing the act of dedicating as an occasion like Nestor's sacrifice in *Odyssey* 3, *viz.*, a successful establishment of joyful relations between dedicator and god through the gift's artistry and beauty. Other epigrams embody that religious outcome in interlocking word order, as in *CEG* 190 (pillar for bronze statue, Athenian Acropolis, ca. 530–520):

σοί μ[ε], θεά, τόδ' ἄγαλμα ἀνέθ]εκε Μελάνθυρο[ς ἔργον] |
εὐχσάμενος δε[κάτ]εν παιδὶ Διὸς μεγέλο.

For you, goddess, Melanthyrus dedicated me, this ἄγαλμα, having vowed a tithe of his works to the child of great Zeus.

As indicated with underlining, two terms referring to Athena and two referring to the dedication form an interlocked sequence in the first line/verse. The pentameter picks up the sequence, but closes it by reversing the elements' order and thus bracketing the dedicator in

⁵⁸ For cultic epiphany as the goal of hymnic performance, see Furley and Bremer (2001: 1.16–20), García (2002). For aesthetic response shading into a sense of divine presence, see Depew (2000: 61–3, 74–5), Stehle (1997: 111). See also Bing (1993b: esp. 181–6 and 192–4).

⁵⁹ Other names include ἀπαρχή (firstfruits) and δεκάτη (tithe). One cannot take epigraphic meaning for granted, since ἄγαλμα could mean "statue (of a god)" in literature, predominantly from the later fifth century, but earlier too, and many dedicated ἀγάλματα were statues.

between (v.1 goddess, object, dedicator—dedicator, object, goddess v.2). In addition, the dedicator's name is itself bracketed between the main verb and participle naming his paired acts of consecration. Syntax and word order verbally fix a bond between Melanthyrus and Athena as mediated by his ἄγαλμα, which functioned ritually (and still functions in words) as poetic ἀγάλματα do.

As *CEG* 190 illustrates, epigrams also locate ἀγάλματα in a reader's and viewer's *hic et nunc*, that is, they frame encounters with dedications as *Nemean* 8 does its performance. Again, there is an especially close correlation between ἄγαλμα as the name for the dedication and both deictic expressions like “this (ἄγαλμα)” and prayers or other direct address to the god. With the former, readers frame their encounters as immediate contact with an object that succeeded religiously in the past through its artistry and beauty, and still has those qualities.⁶⁰ With addresses to the god, readers frame an encounter as contact with the god and, in prayers, as a ritual in which they⁶¹ request a friendly response from the god through the mediation of the ἄγαλμα, just as the dedicator did successfully before. *CEG* 227 adds the hope that the dedicator may do so again (column for bronze statue, Athenian Acropolis, ca. 500–480):

φαρθένε, ἐν ἀκροπόλει Τελεσῖνος | ἄγαλμ' ἀνέθεκεν
Κέτιος ἡὲ χαίροσα διδοίεις | ἄλλο ἀναθέναι.

Virgin, Telesinus of Cettus dedicated (this) ἄγαλμα on the Acropolis; may you, experiencing pleasure (verb χαίρω) in it, grant (him) to dedicate another.

Now, imagine, if you will, a viewer's response to the statuettes of Athena Promachos that probably stood atop the supports inscribed with *CEG* 190 and 227.⁶² Viewers could well experience pleasure in the sculptures' beauty, glitter, and ornamentality, an aesthetic response poets associate with χάρις (beauty, allure, pleasure) and χαίρω (I rejoice

⁶⁰ Elmer (2005: 6–15) would object that τόδε joined to “me” encodes, not a reader's or hearer's position, but the unity of dedication and text. However, audiences of vocally read inscriptions could hear it differently; see the next note.

⁶¹ This applies, technically, only to epigrams like *CEG* 227 with open deixis; “me” in 190 blocks readers from assuming this role, although hearers could participate as the interested audience of a reader giving voice to the dedication. See Elmer (2005: 13–4, with n. 38), Svenbro (1993: 44–6).

⁶² For such statuettes, see Keesling (2003b: 81–4, with fig. 22). Other possibilities are a horse (190, see Raubitschek (1949: no. 234)) and a kouros (227, see Kissas (2000: 232–3)).

in), as well as ἄγαλμα.⁶³ That pleasure could mediate social negotiation by rendering viewers sympathetic to the dedication's status claims about the dedicator.⁶⁴ If the images were sufficiently impressive, radiant, and beautiful, viewers might experience a sense of divine presence, so the contact with deity verbally constructed in the epigrams would be emotionally reified.⁶⁵ In such circumstances, ἄγαλμα would successfully frame the performance of reading while viewing: it lays claim to beauty actually perceived, and to social and religious effects actually achieved. Furthermore, since ἄγαλμα also thematizes the original dedicatory ritual, viewers' responses enacted the effects claimed for that ritual. Performance was reenactment.

I have argued that archaic and earlier classical inscribed epigram preserves a fossil of performance. Like any fossil, epigram contains clues about the living original—clues about how readers and viewers responded, or at least indications of how the makers envisaged response. I believe we have clues to actual responses, because, thanks to our understanding of traditional poetic referentiality, the mechanics and effects of performances, and responses to works of art, we can hypothesize plausibly about the success of epigrams as performance frames. If an epigram frames the encounter with its monument as pitiful lament or joyful interaction with deity, and if the reader or hearer experienced a heightened sense of tragic loss in viewing the image of a deceased youth or pleasurable awe before a divine image, then the performance of reading while viewing would seem to be framed or cued correctly. Statues, reliefs, paintings, and many other fine objects and impressive monuments certainly produced such emotional heightening, so epigrams likely did function successfully as performance frames. Moreover, as was the case with performances and rituals, the effects were social and/or religious as well as aesthetic: relationships were formed and ordered, and the ideologies behind them (e.g., the value of *pro patria mori*, a god's place in the pantheon, the qualities inherent in elite status) were

⁶³ MacLachlan (1993: 34–9 and *passim*), Steiner (2001: 194–8), Stewart (1997: 19, 67). For these features in archaic art, see Fowler (1983, 1984), Hurwit (1985: 18–24).

⁶⁴ For dedicating beautiful objects as euergetism, see *CEG* 767, 773, perhaps 875, with Steiner (2001: 272–3) citing Kurke (1991: 163–94).

⁶⁵ For religious responses to viewing divine images with such features, see Gordon (1979: esp. 13–4), Steiner (2001: 95–134, 172–84). For such religious efficacy in viewing dedications as well as “cult statues,” see Donohue (1997), Elsner (1996), Keesling (2003b: 149–61). See also Freedberg (1989: 27–40, 61–81), Scheer (2000: 44–6, 96–8).

presented and negotiated. The acts of viewing and reading contributed to the construction of a community of worshippers and their deity, or of the living and their stable dead. Those acts were as grounded in polis (or other communal) culture as the performances and rituals with which the epigrams associate them.

Did readings of Hellenistic inscribed epigrams function as performance frames too, contextualizing encounters with monuments as familiar kinds of communal occasion? Or did they frame viewings differently, perhaps more in terms of private experience? I leave this issue to experts in fourth-century and Hellenistic epigraphy and monuments, but one notes indications both of change and of continuity.⁶⁶ A decline in the use of ἄγαλμα on dedications, for example, might betoken a decline of traditional ceremonial language in epigrams and thus perhaps of their role as performance framing.⁶⁷ On the other hand, viewing works of art dedicated in sanctuaries continued to generate powerful religious responses, especially in the presence of ritual framing like that we can reconstruct from a second-century sacred law from Miletus: during a religious procession, celebrants were to stop and sing their paean at a place identified by archaic dedications that stood there, “at Chares’ statues.” Chares’ sixth-century image survives, and its original inscription calls it ἄγαλμα (with its traditional meaning).⁶⁸ For Hellenistic viewers, the reading of epigrams, old or new, might reinforce the kind of ritual framing those Milesian celebrants experienced.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ E.g., honorific epigrams were newly popular (above, n. 33); but accompanying prose inscriptions can discuss the ceremony of crowning (e.g., *CEG* 890), so reading the epigram could reenact the proclamation made during that ceremony. Compare McLean (2002: 239).

⁶⁷ The second volume of *CEG* offers only five fourth-century examples. The word came to assume its prose meaning of “statue”; see McLean (2002: 244).

⁶⁸ For the law, see Sokolowski (1955: no. 50, line 30); for the dedication, Keesling (2003b: 18–9, with fig. 7; 105). Pausanias shows how a pilgrim’s tour through a sanctuary’s monuments and inscriptions could be similarly ritualized, with powerful effects; see Elsner (2000).

⁶⁹ Colleagues too numerous to acknowledge here have fostered my long investigation of archaic epigrams. I can thank only Leslie Preston Day for her critical eye, and Georgia Tsouvala and M.B. Richardson for advice on Hellenistic epigraphy. I am also indebted to the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and Wabash College.

INSCRIBED EPIGRAM IN PRE-HELLENISTIC LITERARY SOURCES

Andrej Petrovic

Pre-Hellenistic inscribed epigram is an occasional genre *par excellence*, and this has several implications. The most important of these is that inscribed epigram was always written for a specific context: deeply rooted both in the occasion which inspired it as well as in its material context, it sometimes presupposes that the reader possesses the knowledge of the occasion which brought it forth, and often refers to its physical surroundings.¹ Inscribed epigram, however, not only derives from but also designs the event which inspired its existence and the material world it inhabits: some of the public epigrams, i.e., epigrams written for a certain group (e.g., a polis, organization, association, *vel sim.*) demonstrate clearly the intentions of the group which set the epigram in the public space and reflect its own view of a particular event. Thus, even if inscribed epigram in the pre-Hellenistic period issues forth as a record of an historical event such as a dedication or death, and thereby conveys the pretension of historical objectivity, it remains a source which tells us less about the actual event (sc. “what really happened”) and more about the shaping of the event by the group or person who had the text inscribed and its significance for them.

Inscribed epigram of the pre-Hellenistic period is thus closely confined within its original time, space, and social milieu. Yet it was not entirely occasional or completely immobile. Inscribed epigram could be conveyed orally, through quotations, and possibly even in collections long before it became a pet genre of Hellenistic poets. Since oral traditions are hard to pin down and our knowledge of pre-Hellenistic collections of epigrams is rather limited (to say the least), the quotations of inscribed epigrams in literary sources remain, together with the actual inscriptions, the only lights glimmering in epigram’s dark pre-Hellenistic history. At the same time, literary quotations of inscribed epigrams mark a new chapter in the genre’s history: because

¹ See Day in this volume.

pre-Hellenistic epigram was so reliant on its physical context, the book can be seen as its natural enemy—it bereaves the epigram of the entire system of semantic references which can be only partially replaced by the medium in which it is transplanted. In this new medium, the authors who quote the epigrams decide whether they will supplement the epigram's missing references by their own narrative (see below on Plato and the Midas epigram). It is now their decision if and how much of the epigram's original context will be revealed to a reader, thus ultimately paving the way to the destabilization of the epigram's system of references, which will become one of the essential features of the Hellenistic epigrams: from the Hellenistic period onwards literary epigram embraces a new aesthetic, one of evasion. From this period on, the text deliberately sets in motion an "Ergänzungsspiel," a game played by an epigram's reader whose task is to identify the nature of the epigram's missing references.²

The aims of this chapter are twofold: a rough overview of the explicit references to the inscribed epigrams in some of the more important pre-Hellenistic literary sources (passages, sources, attributions, terminology),³ and a demonstration of the discrepancy between these sources' perception of the aesthetic qualities of the pre-Hellenistic epigram and the aesthetic judgement a fifth-century Greek could, perhaps, have had.

Herodotus quotes or mentions 24 inscriptions,⁴ almost always to support his current narrative, but he seldom derives his narrative from an inscription. There are eight verse inscriptions, all of them fully quoted,

² On the phenomenon of "Ergänzungsspiel," see Bing (1995b).

³ Preger (1891) collects the epigrams quoted in the literary sources. Since he organizes his collection by genre of epigrams, and not by sources, for an index of ancient authors quoting epigrams see Page (1981: 591–8). Boas (1905) is very useful on this subject as well. Collecting all the allusions to inscribed epigram in pre-Hellenistic poetry will, regrettably, have to remain a task for future: It is possible to note here only that ever more references of pre-Hellenistic poetry to archaic and classical epigram are being recognized (e.g. in Pindar's odes: most recent example is Fenno on *Pi. Nem.* 6 (2003: 344–6); on epigram in tragedy see Di Marco (1997b)).

⁴ On inscriptions in Hdt. see: Raubitschek (1961: 59–61); Volkmann (1975: 43–5); West (1985: 278–80); Pritchett (1985: 164–77); Fehling (1989: 146–56); Pritchett (1993: 144–90); Higbie (1999: 43–83, esp. 56–9); Osborne (2002: 510–3). The most comprehensive overview of the epigraphic evidence used by Herodotus is still Volkmann's (1975: 43–5): a) non-Greek inscriptions: 1.93, 1.187, 2.102, 2.106, 2.105, 2.125, 2.136, 2.141, 3.88, 4.87, 4.91, 7.30. b) inscriptions in Greek (verse inscriptions excepted): 1.51 (possibly verse), 6.14, 8.22, 8.82.

as opposed to frequent paraphrases of the prose inscriptions.⁵ The terminology used for verse inscriptions is the following:⁶ when explicitly denoting an inscribed epigram, the historian distinguishes between a) epigrams consisting of only one (hexametric) verse or composed in elegiac couplets (ἐπιγράμματα, being used for both: the earliest use of the term) and b) verse inscriptions consisting of more than one hexameter (ἐν ἑξαμέτρῳ τόνῳ λέγει).⁷ The eight verse inscriptions are the following:

- a) 4.88, the votive epigram of the famous Greek architect Mandrocles (= Simonides 4 *FGE*)
- b) 5.59–61, three verse inscriptions in Cadmean letters on the tripods in the temple of Ismenian Apollo at Thebes⁸
- c) 5.77, the dedicatory epigram inscribed on the base of a chariot from the Athenian acropolis, dedicated after the victory of Athenians over Boeotians and Chalcidians in 507/6 (= Simonides 3 *FGE*)
- d) 7.228, the three verse inscriptions from the Thermopylae memorial (= Simonides 6 and 22 a and b *FGE*)

There has been a lively discussion about the sources from which Herodotus drew his quotations. Three basic suggestions have been made (echoing the controversy about Herodotus' sources in general):⁹ a) oral traditions ("hearsay"),¹⁰ b) autopsy,¹¹ and c) generally fictitious sources.¹² It is unlikely that Herodotus quotes any epigrams from a written source other than the inscription itself. On different occasions Herodotus explicitly claims that he himself has seen the inscriptions (most notably those in Cadmean letters, 5.59–61), whereas even when

⁵ On prose inscriptions see Volkmann (1975: 62–3) and West (1985: 285) along with Polyæn. (1.30.7), Plu. (*Them.* 9.2) and Just. (2.12.3).

⁶ The best overview of the history of the term epigram is that of Puelma (1996).

⁷ Can this terminology be connected to the metrical development of the verse inscriptions and the "elegiac revolution" which took place some time in the mid 6th century and which largely replaced the until then dominant form of hexametric and iambic inscriptions? A good starting point for this sort of inquiry would be Gallavotti (1979), Hansen (1978: 195–201) and Wallace (1984: 303–15).

⁸ For discussion of the Cadmean letters with further bibliography see Bernal (1990: 4, 31–2).

⁹ On Herodotus and written sources see now Hornblower (2002: 374–86) and Osborne (2002: 510–3). For bibliography on source-citations on Herodotus see Hornblower (2002: 374, n. 1).

¹⁰ Page (1981: 233–5); West (1985: 289).

¹¹ Jacoby (1913: col. 272).

¹² Fehling (1989: 255).

he does not so state, there is solid evidence that he visited the regions the verse inscriptions come from.¹³ While this fact does not demand it, it does allow for autopsy. A telling example of the problems surrounding the autopsy theory is the dedicatory epigram at Herodotus 5.77:

ἔθνεα Βοιωτῶν καὶ Χαλκιδέων δαμάσαντες
παῖδες Ἀθηναίων, ἔργμασιν ἐν πολέμου
δεσμῷ ἐν ᾧ χυνέντι σιδηρέῳ ἔσβεσαν ὕβριν
τῶν ἵππους δεκάτην Παλλάδι τάσδ' ἔθεσαν.

Having overpowered the tribes of Boeotians and Chalcidians
in the endeavors of the war, young men of Athens
quenched their hybris in the miserable iron shackle,
and dedicated these mares to Pallas as the tithe thereof.

This epigram is known both from literary sources and epigraphic evidence. The epigraphic evidence displays two different versions. The first stone (*IG* I² 394), inscribed soon after 507/6, was destroyed during the sack of Athens by the Persians and replaced by a new one (*IG* I 334a and 373) probably some time in the 450s. The republished epigram, however, differs from the original which placed the first verse third. Furthermore, it is quite likely that the republished version demonstrates a recontextualization: it has been argued that the reinscription occurred after the Athenian intervention in a stasis in Euboea in 454.¹⁴ Interestingly, no extant written source (there are five, including Herodotus)¹⁵ quotes the older version. Bearing this in mind, as well as the most probable date of Herodotus' visit to Athens, the 440s or later, and given the accuracy of the quotation, it seems quite likely that his main source for the verse inscription was indeed autopsy. The apparent lack of an oral tradition handing down the earlier version and Herodotus' description of the exact setting of the dedication offer further support to this view.¹⁶

Even though numerous authors are mentioned in the *Histories*, the authorship of the inscribed epigrams quoted by Herodotus is never stated.¹⁷ However, at 7.228 Simonides is mentioned in connection with

¹³ Pritchett (1993).

¹⁴ Schreiner (1976: 26–31).

¹⁵ Hdt. 5.77; Diod. 10.24.3; Aristid. *Or.* 28.64; *P. Oxy.* 2535; *AP* 6.343.

¹⁶ For Herodotus, autopsy and verse inscriptions see Petrovic (2007). The wording used in Herodotus to describe the position of the dedicated chariot is sometimes regarded as possibly imprecise; see Osborne (2002: 511).

¹⁷ For the authors mentioned in the *Histories* see Osborne (2002: 510).

the epigram for the seer Megistias which was a part of the Thermopylae memorial:

ἐπιγράμμασι μὲν νυν καὶ στήλῃσι ἔξω ἢ τὸ τοῦ μάντιος ἐπίγραμμα
Ἀμφικτύονές εἰσὶ σφραγῶν οἱ ἐπικοσμήσαντες, τὸ δὲ τοῦ μάντιος Μεγιστίῳ
Σιμωνίδῃς ὁ Λεωπρέπείος ἐστὶ κατὰ ξεινίην ὁ ἐπιγράψας.

Except for the seer's epigram, the Amphictyionians are the ones who sponsored the epigrams and the stones. But it was Simonides, son of Leoprepes, who had the epigram for Megistias inscribed, because of [their] bond of *xenia*.

As far as the question of authorship is concerned, this passage is irrelevant since its focus is on financial matters. However, it is only logical that the Amphictyony engaged Simonides to compose also the epigrams for the Peloponnesians and Spartans (20a and b *FGE*), since it was this poet who is named as the one who "had the epigram inscribed" for the seer Megistias.¹⁸ The epigram on Mandrocles (4 *FGE*) was attached to the corpus of epigrams ascribed to Simonides by Denys Page, but no source attributes it to the poet and there is no reason to suppose that Simonides is its author. In the case of the epigram composed for the Athenian dedication, two sources attribute these poems to Simonides, implicitly Aristid. *Or.* 28.64 and, if the supplement stands, explicitly *P. Oxy.* 2535.¹⁹

Thucydides, more sparing than the comparably lavish Herodotus, quotes only three epigrams:

- a) the dedicatory epigram of the Spartan regent Pausanias inscribed on the Serpent-column in Delphi (1.132.2 = Simonides 17a *FGE*),
- b) the dedicatory epigram of the younger Peisistratus inscribed on the altar in the sanctuary of Pythian Apollo in Athens (6.54.5–7 = Simonides 26b *FGE*) and
- c) the funerary epigram for the daughter of the Peisistratid Hippias, Archedice, who was buried in Lampsacus (6.59.2–3 = Simonides 26a *FGE*).

Thucydides apparently drew on a variety of sources in quoting epigrams. As is well known, his use of sources was regarded as exemplary

¹⁸ Molyneux (1992: 175–9) and Sider in this volume.

¹⁹ On the papyrus, written next to the fragment of the epigram, only]μωνι.[of the author's name can be read. The papyrus' editors have pondered the possibility that the name of the author was written only to discard his authorship. This is very unlikely.

already in antiquity. Dionysius of Halicarnassus praises the historian for availing himself of autopsy or reports from trustworthy sources, and dismissing hearsay gathered from the people one stumbles upon (τῶν ἐπιτυχόντων ἀκουσμάτων).²⁰ However, it is not always simple to discern Thucydides' exact sources for the inscriptions.²¹ Finley and Higbie argue that there is not much reason to suppose that Thucydides must have seen the inscriptions he quotes; Stroud and Derow argue the opposite and emphasize the role of autopsy.²² In the case of the epigrams it is certain that at least one is quoted on the basis of the autopsy: the epigram of the younger Peisistratus is followed by the historian's comment on the condition of the letters.²³ In the case of the sepulchral epigram of Archedice it is difficult to determine the original source. In light of Thucydides' exile and his frequent travels it is not impossible that he had a chance to see the epigram in Lampsacus. On the other hand, its text may have been reported to him orally as well. Not even the possibility of some kind of fifth-century epigrammatic collection or a literary source can be discarded out of hand.²⁴ The scandalous epigram of the Spartan regent Pausanias²⁵ (Simonides 17a *FGE*) which was inscribed upon the base of the Serpent-column at Delphi survived on the monument only a short time before it was erased. Thucydides' source for this particular epigram was most likely the oral tradition which—judging from the reaction of the Greeks and the haste with which the epigram was eradicated—seems to have spread the poem very quickly throughout the Greek world. This likelihood might be confirmed by the multitude of literary sources which quote the epigram,²⁶ as well as by the different dialectal forms in which the epigram survives.

²⁰ D.H. *Th.* VI. Cf. Higbie (1999: 59).

²¹ On the use of inscriptions in Thucydides see Hornblower (1987: 88–92); Meyer (1970); Kirchhoff (1985) and Müller (1997). Cf. also Pritchett (1975: 54, n. 20).

²² Finley (1983: 207); Higbie (1999: 59): “We can be even less sure than we are with Herodotus that Thucydides examined the inscriptions he does mention, because nothing in his account must be understood to mean that he saw the stones himself.” See also Stroud (1994: 300–4) and Derow (1994: 73–90).

²³ Cf. Jacoby (1949: 163).

²⁴ Thus Wade-Gery (1933: 94).

²⁵ Though inscribed on the thank offering of all the allies to Delphian Apollo, it labeled Pausanias as the single handed slayer of the Persians and the chieftain of all Greeks and implied furthermore that the Serpent-column, the dedication of all the Greeks who fought against the Persians, was his personal dedication.

²⁶ Ps.-Demosth. *Or.* 59 (in *Neaeram*), 97; Aristodemus *Hist. FGrH.* 2a 104F, Fr. 1.108; Plu. *De. Hdt. mal.* 42.873 C 8; Pausan. 3.8.2 c.a.n.; Suda s.v. Πανσάνιας (π 820); *AP* 6.197; Apostolius [Arsenius] *Paroemiogr. Apophthegmata* 7.9d.

None of the epigrams is accompanied by an attribution to a poet—no surprise given that Thucydides refers to only three authors, Homer, Hesiod and Hellanicus. All three epigrams, however, were attributed to Simonides by later authors: notoriously, it is Aristotle who ascribes the funerary epigram for Archedice to Simonides, thereby providing the first explicit and fairly certain attribution of an epigram to this poet.²⁷ The dedicatory epigram of Pausanias the regent is attributed to Simonides by Pausanias the geographer,²⁸ whereas the epigram for the younger Peisistratus is attached to the corpus of Simonidean verse inscriptions by Denys Page, apparently on the assumption that it was included in the *Garland* of Meleager.²⁹

Thucydides labels the epigrams on Archedice and on Peisistratus as ἐπιγράμματα. Remarkably, however, in the case of the epigram of Pausanias which was erased soon after it was inscribed, Thucydides introduces a different term: ἐλεγεῖον. At first glance the terms ἐλεγεῖον and ἐπίγραμμα seem to be synonymous.³⁰ But there may be some differences: ἐλεγεῖον seems to denote here an epigram which has lost its physical context and is orally conveyed.³¹ If this distinction is valid, then for Thucydides and others of the late fifth and early fourth century the term ἐπίγραμμα may have indicated the unity of the poem (ἐλεγεῖον) and its physical bearer.

In conclusion, epigrams quoted by the historians are used as sources in the broad sense of the word, with this difference. Herodotus uses epigrams almost always as a confirmation of his narrative, whereas Thucydides—at least in the case of the offspring of Peisistratus (6.54–9)—weaves his story around the epigrams and actually draws his information from a poem (most notably for Peisistratus the younger, 6.54–5). In addition, even though both Herodotus and Thucydides quote complete epigrams—apparently without textual tinkering³²—and construe the historical context, there are some substantial differences between them from a reader's point of view. Whereas Thucydides is

²⁷ Arist. *Rh.* 1.90.30 (= 1367b): καὶ τὸ τοῦ Σιμωνίδου.

²⁸ Pausan. 3.8.2.

²⁹ Page (1981: 121–2).

³⁰ On this, West (1974: 3–5); Bowie (1986: 25–7); Gutzwiller (1998b: 47–9).

³¹ Gutzwiller (1998b: 47–8, n. 3).

³² There has been some discussion on whether the epigram for the fallen from the Peloponnesus in Hdt. 7.228 (= Simonides 22a *FGE*) was quoted completely or not. There is no reason to consider it incomplete if one reads it as an epideictic epigram; see Lazenby (1993: 148) and Pritchett (1985: 169–71).

relatively stingy with information on the exact physical context of an epigram, Herodotus often makes more effort to provide it. As noted by Bing, this can be clearly observed in the case of the epigram for the Samian architect Mandrocles: Herodotus not only quotes the epigram itself and offers background information on Mandrocles and the significance of his endeavor for the Persians, he also describes the dedicated painting in considerable detail and states where the epigram was placed.³³ While no epigram is so cited by either Herodotus or Thucydides as to tickle a reader's imagination or incite him to start the game of supplementation, the "Ergänzungsspiel,"³⁴ some Hellenistic tendencies can be observed as early as Herodotus. Out of eight cited epigrams, six of them are gathered together in two series. One series consists of three dedicatory epigrams dealing with the tripods from the temple of Ismenian Apollo; the other of three epigrams dealing with the battle of Thermopylae and the fallen. These two "mini-collections" anticipate the practices of the Hellenistic age. Since the contexts are given, however, the reader of Herodotus' collection is in a different position from that of the reader of a Hellenistic anthology. Herodotus may not involve his reader in supplementation, but in a game that compares the epigrams to the narrative Herodotus supplies for them. Consider, for example, the Thermopylae series (7.228):

...ἐπιγράφεται γράμματα λέγοντα τάδε·
 μυριάσιν ποτὲ τῆδε τριηκοσίαις ἐμάχοντο
 ἐκ Πελοποννήσου χιλιάδες τέτορες.
 ταῦτα μὲν δὲ τοῖσι πᾶσι ἐπιγράφεται, τοῖσι δὲ Σπαρτιήτησι ἰδίῃ·
 ὃ ξεῖν' ἀγγέλειν Λακεδαιμονίοις ὅτι τῆδε
 κείμεθα, τοῖς κείνων ρήμασι πειθόμενοι.
 Λακεδαιμονίοισι μὲν δὴ τοῦτο, τῷ δὲ μάντι τόδε·
 Μνήμα τόδε κλεινοῦ Μεγιστία, ὃν ποτὲ Μῆδοι
 Σπερχειὸν ποταμὸν κτεῖναν ἀμειψάμενοι,
 μάντιος, ὃς τότε Κῆρας ἐπερχομένας σάφα εἰδώς
 οὐκ ἔτλη Σπάρτης ἡγεμόνας προλιπεῖν.

... the words were inscribed saying the following:
 "Once upon a time three million fought on this place
 against four thousand from Peloponnesus."

This was written actually for all of them, but for the Spartans was separately inscribed:

³³ Bing (1995b: 117).

³⁴ On the "Ergänzungsspiel" and the reader-response aesthetics of Hellenistic epigrams, see Bing (1995b: 118–23).

“Stranger, tell the Lacedaemonians that here
 we lie, obedient to their orders.”
 That for the Lacedaemonians and for their prophet as follows:
 “This is the gravestone (*mnema*) of the famed Megistias whom the Medes
 once
 killed after they passed over the river Spercheios—
 of the seer, who at that point knew very well that doom was about to
 fall,
 but could not find it in his heart to desert the Spartan leaders.”

After reporting the Persian progress from the pass of Tempe to Thermopylae and describing in considerable detail the battle at Thermopylae, stressing both the illustrious role of the Thespians as well as the less illustrious role of the Thebans, Herodotus lists the epigrams financed by the Amphictyony. Astonishingly there is not a word in them about the role of the Thespians who lost their entire army at Thermopylae, or for that matter about any other Greek forces except the Peloponnesians. Besides them, only the Acarnanian seer Megistias was mentioned on the memorial in Herodotus’ day³⁵—and this thanks not to the Amphictyony but to Simonides (see above). The obvious discrepancy between Herodotus’ report of the Greek forces preparing for the battle and the epigrams invites the reader to probe the true merits of the single *poleis* in the battle of Thermopylae. The ever narrower focus forced on the reader by the series as it is arranged elicits his critical reflection. The series starts with the first epigram mentioning undefined millions and Peloponnesian thousands, leads to the Three Hundred Spartans, and ends with the destiny of a single man whose origin is not mentioned in his sepulchral epigram. It is exactly this oddity which will remind a careful reader that Megistias is an Acarnanian—i.e., that he is not from Peloponnesus—and prompt him to think of other Greeks who fought at Thermopylae and remained without mention. When one compares the epigrams financed by the Amphictyony, which was apparently heavily influenced by the Spartans at the time the memorial was erected, with the rest of Herodotus’ report, it is hard to evade simultaneous feelings of admiration for Sparta’s greatness in battle and chagrin at its pettiness in refusing to recognize the accomplishments of other *poleis* at Thermopylae in September 480 B.C.

³⁵ On the number of stelae in Thermopylae as well as the role of Amphictyony, see Petrovic (2007).

Fourth-century orators' habit of quoting epigrams is similar to that of the fifth-century historians. Epigrams are usually quoted in the context of the event which brought them forth, with an aim to instruct, remind, horrify, and prove a point.³⁶ But when we compare a fifth-century orator's use of documents with that of a fourth-century orator, we notice that ever more decrees found their place in the orations of the fourth century. This trend can be observed in the case of the epigrams as well. Whereas Isocrates, Lysias and Andocides do not quote a single inscribed epigram, Aeschines and Demosthenes³⁷ do substantiate their arguments with (anonymously quoted) epigrams. Why this change takes place remains yet to be explained.³⁸

Since the epigrams quoted by Aeschines and Demosthenes come from Athens, it is very likely that their main source was autopsy. Nevertheless in the case of Aeschines' citation of the famous Eion epigrams (*In Ctes.* 183 = Simonides 40 *FGE*) there are those, myself included, who believe that some kind of a collection could have been used.³⁹ A serious obstacle for an investigation of the sources used by orators is a peculiarity in the transmission of oratorical texts. Since orators, while delivering a speech, did not quote the epigrams themselves, but instead asked notaries to read aloud a given document, the originally published text of the oration did not always include the references to the material quoted in court. This opened the doors for interpolations during transmission, which are not always easy to recognize and can be only rarely proved.⁴⁰

Aeschines and Demosthenes often quote or mention inscribed epigrams in order to remind their public of the admirable older system of values by drawing their attention to the merits of earlier generations. It is thus hard to avoid the impression that the propagandistic value of epigram in public discourse was recognized from the fourth century on in oratory, and probably as early as the fifth century in inscribed epigram itself.⁴¹ Nothing illustrates this more clearly than the epigrams

³⁶ Many specific developments in the use of epigrams in rhetoric are not possible to sketch in detail here and remain a task for future scholarly work.

³⁷ Aeschin. *In Ctes.* 184, 190. Dem. 7.40; *De cor.* 289.

³⁸ On this see Thomas (1989: 86–9).

³⁹ Wade-Gery (1933: 94–5).

⁴⁰ The most notorious example of the problem of the authenticity of epigrams transmitted in the fourth century orations concerns that on the fallen at Chaeronea in 338. Dem. *De cor.* 289 (= Anon. 126 *FGE*).

⁴¹ This aspect of pre-Hellenistic epigram deserves a much more thorough and sys-

quoted by Aeschines (Simonides 40 *FGE*), which were cut upon three Herms, set in the Athenian Agora after 475 B.C. to glorify the capture of Eion (by Cimon). The epigrams deal with Athens' past, present, and future: starting off in the first epigram⁴² with an explicit allusion to Homer's portrayal of Menestheus, the leader of the Athenian troops in the Trojan War, the second epigram projects forward to the contemporary victory against Persians at Eion. The third epigram caps the series with a moral for future generations:

ἡγεμόνεσσι δὲ μισθὸν Ἀθηναῖοι τάδ' ἔδωκαν
 ἀντ' εὐεργεσίας καὶ μεγάλων ἀγαθῶν·
 μᾶλλον τις τάδ' ἰδὼν καὶ ἐπεσσομένων ἐθελήσει
 ἀμφὶ περὶ ξυνοῖς πράγμασι δῆριν ἔχειν.

And to their leaders the Athenians gave these things as remuneration
 for their benefactions and great merits.
 Someone, even of future generations, upon seeing these things, will be
 more eager
 to take part in the struggle for common good.

The term used by the orators to denote an inscribed epigram is ἐπίγραμμα. However, the meaning of this term was expanded from the fourth century B.C. on, and it now had widened its meaning to include the inscribed prose text as well. When Demosthenes, for example, lists a series of dedicatory prose inscriptions, he labels them simply as ἐπιγράμματα.⁴³ An interesting line of further inquiry might measure the impact of the broadened meaning of ἐπίγραμμα as a reflection of the propagandistic value set upon texts in the public space.

With the philosophical writings, we part to some extent from the principle of accuracy characteristic of the historians' citations of inscribed epigrams—and the orators' too, to a point—and enter the realm of a more dynamic relationship with an inscribed epigram. Among the many literary and inscriptional sources Plato quotes,⁴⁴ two passages in which epigrams are cited deserve special attention since they nicely illuminate

tematic study than I can offer here. On the propaganda value of Hellenistic epigram see Cameron (1995: 291).

⁴² This is the order of epigrams advocated, e.g., by Page (1981: 255–7), not that used by Aeschines. Actually, the moralizing, propagandistic value is all the more emphatic in Aeschines' order, where it is tailored to the particular point he is making.

⁴³ Dem. 24.180–1.

⁴⁴ On Plato's quotations in general see: Tarrant (1951: 59–67) and Demos (1999).

Plato's creative approach: the famous Midas epigram (*Phaedr.* 264c–d (= *GVI* 1171)) and those from Hipparchus' herms (*Hipp.* 228e).

The Midas epigram, one of the most discussed and most controversial epigrams of antiquity,⁴⁵ is quoted by several authors. It was regarded in antiquity, at least by some, to be the composition of Homer, whereas others attributed the poem to Cleobulus of Lindus, one of the seven sages.⁴⁶ Here is the complete text of the epigram as quoted in *Cert. Hom. et Hes.* (15) and by Diogenes Laertius (for variants see *GVI* 1171 and 1171a and b):

χαλκῇ παρθένος εἰμί, Μίδα δ' ἐπὶ σήματι κεῖμαι.
 ἔστ' ἂν ὕδωρ τε νάηι καὶ δένδρεα μακρὰ τεθήληι
 καὶ ποταμοὶ πλήθωσι, περικλύζῃ δὲ θάλασσα,
 ἥελιος δ' ἀνίων φαίνῃ λαμπρά τε σελήνη,
 αὐτοῦ τῇδε μένουσα πολυκλαύτῳ ἐπὶ τύμβῳ
 σημανέω παριοῦσι, Μίδας ὅτι τῇδε τέθαπται.

I am a maiden of brass and I am placed on Midas' sepulcher.
 As long as water flows and tall trees bud,
 and rivers are full, and sea washes the shores,
 and rising sun shines and gleaming moon,
 waiting here on his much-mourned tomb,
 I convey to passers by, that Midas is buried here.”

Of the many uncertainties surrounding this poem, including the number of verses in the original version, variant readings, authorship, exact original context, and date of the poem, the number of verses is of paramount importance for present purposes. Plato, as opposed to Diogenes Laertius, quotes only four verses, the first two and the last two; verses three and four thus appear to be some kind of a later addendum. However, Diogenes Laertius 1.89–90, a statement much referred to in studies of pre-Hellenistic epigram, says that Simonides composed a poem alluding precisely to the third and fourth verses of the Midas epigram,⁴⁷ suggesting that the “added” lines antedate Plato by a century.

In the *Phaedrus*, a dialogue concerned with rhetoric, among other things, Plato has Socrates and Phaedrus analyze the parts of a λόγος (here “speech”) and discuss in this context a speech of Lysias on eros.

⁴⁵ For discussion and bibliography see Raubitschek (1968: 12–5) and Bing (1995b: 117–9).

⁴⁶ Interestingly, Diogenes Laertius rejects the attribution of the poem to Homer because “Homer lived long before Midas” (1.89–90).

⁴⁷ Bergk fr. 57; *PMG* 581.

In a part of the dialogue full of ironic undertones, Socrates finds many faults with Lysias' speech and says (264b–e):

Socr. Still, I think you would agree that every speech should be constructed like a living being, that it should have some kind of a body of its own, so it is neither headless nor footless, but it should have a middle and extremities which harmonize with each other and with the work at large.

Phae. But of course.

Socr. Well, ponder then upon your friend's speech and whether it possesses this quality or not. You will find that there is no difference in the epigram of which they say that it's inscribed for Midas of Phrygia.

Phae. What's it like and what's its fault?

Socr. It's this one:

χαλκῇ παρθένος εἰμί, Μίδα δ' ἐπὶ σήματι κεῖμαι.
ὄφρ' ἂν ὕδωρ τε νάηι καὶ δένδρεα μακρὰ τεθήλῃ
αὐτοῦ τῇδε μένουσα πολυκλαύτῳ ἐπὶ τύμβῳ
σημανέω παριοῦσι, Μίδαζ ὅτι τῇδε τέθαιπται.

I am a maiden of brass and I am placed on Midas' sepulcher.

As long as water flows and tall trees bud,

here on his tomb of many tears I reside.

I convey to passers-by, that Midas is buried here.

I suppose you see that there is no difference between what of it is said first or last (sc. the verse).

Phae. You scoff at our speech, Socrates!

Socr. Okay, let's leave this example aside, to avoid upsetting you, although it really does seem to me to contain many examples which would be useful to have a look at (and surely not to try to imitate them).

Let us move to the other speeches, then.

Socrates quotes the epigram in an exchange not directly pertinent to the epigram's original context: after Socrates demonstrates how weak Lysias' knowledge of the subject matter of his speech is, he goes on to criticize his style as well as the arrangement of the speech's parts—both matters of *τέχνη* (literary technique).⁴⁸ It is in this context that the epigram is quoted, since it, much like Lysias' speech, possesses no inherent order, no intrinsic principle in its structure. It can be read, but only in Socrates' version, either starting with verse 1 and ending with verse 4 or the other way around. On Socrates account, the epigram illustrates the shortcomings of Lysias' *technē*—his speech is perhaps not entirely headless or footless; but since the two are interchangeable, the speech as a whole does not resemble a living creature.

⁴⁸ On this Hackforth (1952: 130).

This passage contains two features remarkable for the history of Greek epigram. First, it is the first instance of an epigram's real recontextualization in ancient literary sources (we noted a similar case in epigraphy in the Athenian epigram celebrating their victory over the Chalcidians and Boeotians).⁴⁹

Second, because of this recontextualization readers of this epigram are placed into an entirely new role and invited to play the aforementioned "Ergänzungsspiel." Peter Bing has drawn attention to a chief difference between the quotation of epigrams by historians and by Plato: the Platonic context does not offer any information about the epigram which is not already given in its text (except for Midas being Midas the Phrygian), and therefore forces the reader to decide on his own how to interpret the epigram's "here," "maiden of brass," and "here on his tomb."⁵⁰ How lively this game can be, can be illustrated by quoting just some of the scholarly assumptions made about the epigram and its original context: Weber believed that the epigram describes the site of Midas' grave and imagined the grave as in a sort of a *locus amoenus* like the one from Longus' prologue, with the trees surrounding the grave and the spring nourishing it.⁵¹ Raubitschek tried to reconstruct the memorial on which the lines were inscribed so as to determine the exact order of the lines and their position on the monument.⁵² On the other hand, Preger placed this epigram in the section of his collection entitled "epigrammata quae veteres falso contendunt lapidibus inscripta esse" (1891: 233). The game goes on: we are also invited to discover the identity of speaker. Is the "maiden of brass" a Siren, a Sphinx, or a Ker?⁵³ Finally, a curious reader of the epigram faces a further problem: what is a maiden of brass, whoever she might be, doing on the grave of a man whose touch turned everything into gold?⁵⁴

⁴⁹ See above on Simonides 3 *FGE*.

⁵⁰ Cf. Bing (1995b: 119): "As quoted here out of context, its effect on us is altered... It virtually demands that we act, that we use our heads to supply what is missing."

⁵¹ Weber (1917: 536–40).

⁵² Raubitschek (1968: 14): "Die Sphinx würde also auf einem ionischen Kapitell gegessen haben... Diese Vermutung legt die Vermutung nahe, dass das Epigramm so in drei oder vier Kanneluren eingeschrieben wurde, dass der erste Hexameter in einer stand, die nächsten drei in der links oder rechts daneben stehenden Kannelur und die letzten beiden in der darauf folgenden Kannelur."

⁵³ None of them can be ruled out; see Bing (1995b: 118).

⁵⁴ The story about Midas Aureus is told *in extenso* by Ovid in *Met.* 11.85–145, but it is probably significantly older.

The second remarkable Platonic passage comes from the *Hipparchus* (228–9b). Here, Socrates lists the accomplishments of Hipparchus, son of Peisistratus, and mentions the herms erected by him and bearing gnomic epigrams:

ἐκλεξάμενος ἃ ἡγεῖτο σοφώτατα εἶναι, ταῦτα αὐτὸς ἐντείνας εἰς ἐλεγείον αὐτοῦ ποιήματα καὶ ἐπιδείγματα τῆς σοφίας ἐπέγραψεν.

After he had chosen the [sayings] he thought wisest, he himself turned them into elegiacs, and had his poems and wise declarations inscribed.⁵⁵

The epigrams are quoted here within their historical context. Socrates tells of Hipparchus' efforts to educate the residents of the Attic chora (the territory outside the city), and quotes two of the gnomic epigrams:

μνήμα τόδ' Ἰππάρχου· στεῖχε δίκαια φρονῶν

This is a monument of Hipparchus: walk thinking of just things.

and

μνήμα τόδ' Ἰππάρχου· μὴ φίλον ἐξαπάτα.

This is a monument of Hipparchus: do not deceive a friend.

As can be seen, these epigrams require less engagement on the reader's side than that on Midas' tomb.⁵⁶ Not only do we hear from Plato where the epigrams were inscribed (the deictic τόδ' being explained thus), but he actually specifies the precise position of the lines on the monument.⁵⁷

Even though it is likely that epigrams circulated in the form of collections already by Plato's day, there is no evidence that he quoted these from a book. One can make a case for oral circulation of the epigram

⁵⁵ On the herms of Hipparchus see Crome (1935/6: 300–13); Osborne (1985: 47–58); Lavelle (1985: 411–20) and Bing (2002: 56–8).

⁵⁶ Actually, the engagement on the reader's side is redirected here; as Bing (2002: 57) stresses, Plato's reader must relate the quotation of these particular maxims to the context in the dialogue: "For as the dialogue is largely about those who seek profit by unjust means, the admonition to 'walk with just intent' is apropos. And since those means potentially include even deceiving a friend, the second maxim is equally apt. As he says in conclusion, *he'd* never deceive his friend or disobey the great Hipparchus."

⁵⁷ See 229a: "on the left side of each herm one [sc. inscription] is inscribed in which Hermes states that he stands in the middle of the city or the deme, whereas the other on the right [sc. of the herm] says...."

on Midas. As some of the herms of Hipparchus were still standing in Athens in fourth century B.C., one can argue the same for these.

The terminology used by Plato to denote an epigram is conventional: both for the hexametric sepulchral poem as well as for the gnomic epigrams, the same term, ἐπίγραμμα, is employed. Plato's passages gain value, however, when considered as contemporary perceptions of epigram as a literary genre: we saw above that the sepulchral epigram on Midas was used to assess the *technē* of Lysias, which allows for the assumption that the epigram itself was a matter of *technē*. Lysias' speech is criticized because it resembles a structurally palindromic epigram—not the mark of good *technē* (art, skill) in a speech. But this certainly cannot be understood as a critique of the epigram's *technē*. Its qualities are in no way inferior; they are simply inappropriate when applied to oratory.

Such traces of epigrammatic *technē* are confirmed by inscribed epigrams outside the literary sources. The opening verse of the fifth-century inscribed poem from Halicarnassus bears testimony to this new (?) assessment of epigram (*SGO* 01/12/05): αὐδὴ τεχνήεσσα λίθο, λέγε τίς τοδ' ἄ[γαλμα / στήσεν ("Artful voice of stone, tell! Who dedicated this statue?"). Here, for the first time, the voice of an inscribed epigram is characterized as full of *technē*, i.e., artful. That speaks for a new self-consciousness concerning the genre's artistic potential. No epigram had spoken like that before; nor had any narrator described one in such terms.

Even if we discard the notoriously problematic attributions of epigrams to pre-Hellenistic authors, as well as Herodotus' passage on the role of Simonides in composing the epigrams in Thermopylae, we have to recognize that Plato's passages bear testimony to the process of professionalization in Greek epigram, a process which seems to have been quite advanced in his day: epigram, being a *technē*, is a matter of experts, of τεχνῖται.⁵⁸ Plato has Socrates put special emphasis on the fact that Hipparchus himself, not an expert poet, turned the sayings into elegiacs. As early as Euripides we learn that poets, μουσοποιοί, were being engaged for the task of composing an epigram.⁵⁹

⁵⁸ On Greek poets as professionals cf. Hardie (1983: 15–36).

⁵⁹ Eur. *Tk* 1188–91. Note that the practice is here projected back into the heroic age.

τί καί ποτε
γράψειεν ἄν σοι μουσοποιος ἐν τάφῳ;

What should a poet [*mousopoios*] write for you on your grave someday?

Indeed, throughout the fifth and early fourth century we find ever more indications of the rise of authorial awareness and epigram's literary pretension.⁶⁰

Even though the question of the sources used by Aristotle has attracted a fair amount of scholarly attention,⁶¹ the main focus has remained his use of literary ones. Aristotle's interest in epigraphic sources has been, as Higbie observes, somewhat neglected.⁶² Three passages are of special importance for the study of inscribed epigram:

- a) *EN* 1099a25 and *EE* 1214a5 (τὸ Δηλιακὸν ἐπίγραμμα: the Delian epigram)⁶³
- b) *Rh.* 1365a24–67b18 (τὸ ἐπίγραμμα τῷ Ὀλυμπιονίκῃ: epigram on an Olympic victor, Simonides 41 *FGE*) and,
- c) *Rh.* 1367b20 (sepulchral epigram on Archedice, Simonides 26a *FGE*).

The so-called Delian epigram was inscribed on the propylaea of the Letoon at Delos (*EE* 1214a5); Aristotle quotes the epigram twice, with some textual variations which seem the result of textual transmission.⁶⁴ However, even though the epigram is quoted in Aristotle without attribution, Stobaeus ascribes it to Theognis (and is not alone in doing so).⁶⁵ It is possible that some version of the Theognidean text was available

⁶⁰ Cf. Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 290).

⁶¹ Here I can point just to very few of the more useful works on the subject: Hinman (1935); the indices in Moriatou (1994: 130–42); Smith (1995).

⁶² Higbie (1999: 65).

⁶³ ...τὸ Δηλιακὸν ἐπίγραμμα· κάλλιστον τὸ δικαιοτάτον, λῦστον δ' ὑγιαίνειν· / ἥδιστον δε πέφυχ' οὐ τις ἐρᾷ τὸ τυχεῖν ("...the Delian epigram: What is most just is most beautiful, the best is to be in good health. / But the sweetest thing is getting what one desires"). The poem also comes down as *Theognidea* 255–6. On this epigram see esp. Gutzwiller (1998b: 128–30).

⁶⁴ Instead of ἥδιστον δε πέφυχ' one reads πάντων ἥδιστον. Explanation of the versions after Buddensiek (1999: 44, n. 1).

⁶⁵ Stobaeus 4.39.8 (Hense 903); see also *POxy.* 2380, col. ii–iii, 2–3 c. A.D. Cf. Rackham (1953: 198).

in the Athens of the fourth century B.C.,⁶⁶ but it is not probable that this epigram found its place in such an anthology. One can certainly not exclude an oral tradition, but a case can be made for autopsy: it is known that Aristotle used archaeological⁶⁷ and epigraphic⁶⁸ evidence, and some of his research, like assembling the lists of the victors in the Olympic and Pythian games, did require fieldwork.⁶⁹ Bearing this in mind, even if we cannot come to a certain conclusion about the source of the Delian epigram, it seems logical that the one on the Olympic victor came from his research that led to the compilation of the list of these athletes. This epigram was ascribed to Simonides by a later source, but there is no reason to accept this attribution.⁷⁰ Aristotle quotes it anonymously in one and the same sentence as a verse from the epigram on Archedice, which he attributes unambiguously to Simonides (1367b18–21). This attribution was probably just extended later to the preceding poem. The epigram on Archedice plays a major role in the dating of the *Syll. Sim.*, and it is likely that Aristotle quoted this epigram from this source.⁷¹ As far as terminology is concerned, Aristotle uses conventional terms: when denoting an epigram explicitly, the term ἐπίγραμμα is used.

In Aristotle we observe tendencies in his quotation of epigrams similar to those noted in Plato. Set in new contexts, the epigrams serve as illustrations, as παραδείγματα in his narratives. He does not flinch from treating the epigrams apart from their historical context. In his discussion of praise, for example, demonstrating that circumstances do not necessarily determine human behaviour or success (*Rh.* 1367b17–26), Aristotle juxtaposes a line from the epigram on Archedice, who is praised for not being haughty despite her multiple relations to members of the ruling elite,⁷² with one from an agonistic epigram on a

⁶⁶ Bowie (1997: 65–6): “It seems that in the fourth century some text of Theognis was available, at least to men of philosophical bent in Athens [...]” See also Gronewald (1975: 178).

⁶⁷ Huxley (1972: 157–70); id. (1973: 285–6); id. (1974: 203–4). See also Barnes (1995: 378), Nos. 117–123; Bollansée (1999: 562–5).

⁶⁸ Pickard-Cambridge (1968: 103–25); Higbie (1999: 71).

⁶⁹ Higbie (1999: 65).

⁷⁰ Aristophanes Grammaticus ap. Eust. *Od.* 1761.25, vv. 1–2. ὁ δὲ τὸν σάννον τοῦτον παρασημνόμενος Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικός καὶ ἄλλας ἐκτίθεται καινοφάνους λέξεις, οἷον ἄσιλλαν, σκευὸς τι ἰχθυηρόν, οὗ χρήσις παρὰ Σιμωνίδῃ ἐν τῷ· πρόσθε—ἔφερον.

⁷¹ See Sider in this volume, pp. 123–4.

⁷² Simonides 26a *FGE*: ἀνδρὸς ἀριστεύσαντος ἐν Ἑλλάδι τῶν ἐφ’ ἑαυτοῦ / Ἰππίου

victor on Olympic games, illustrating how he surpassed his previously humble circumstances:⁷³

καὶ τὸ τοῦ ὀλυμπιονίκου·
 πρόσθε μὲν ἄμφ' ὥμοισιν ἔχων τραχεῖαν,
 καὶ τὸ τοῦ Σιμωνίδου·
 ἦ πατὴρς τε καὶ ἀνδρὸς ἀδελφῶν τ' οὐσα τυράννων.

and the saying of the Olympic victor:

"I used to carry on my shoulders a rough..."

As well as the one of Simonides:

"she was daughter and wife and sister of tyrants."

By excerpting the epigrams Aristotle puts his audience in the position of a reader of gnomes, not of epigrams. Indeed, in the case of the Olympic epigram he radically decontextualizes the poem inasmuch as he omits data conventionally included in every epinician—victor's name, parentage, fatherland, and event won—replacing it with the strikingly non-specific τὸ τοῦ ὀλυμπιονίκου.

The same is true of the Delian epigram—the poems quoted are deprived of their references to their physical setting and do not presuppose the role a reader could have adopted in the case of Midas' epigram in Plato's context.⁷⁴

Inscribed epigram quoted in pre-Hellenistic literary sources reveals tendencies which, beginning in the Hellenistic period, become some of the most important features of the genre: processes of decontextualization and recontextualization both in literary and epigraphic sources (Aristotle), intimations toward "Ergänzungsspiel" in Plato, the genesis of epigrammatic collections in what I've called Herodotus' "mini-collections," and the process of professionalization in the genre (Herodotus, Plato).

In spite of the fact that the relevant epigrams are now easily accessible due to the appearance of Hansen's *CEG* volumes some 20 years ago, it

Ἀρχεδίκην ἦδε κέκευθε κόνις, / ἦ πατὴρς τε καὶ ἀνδρὸς ἀδελφῶν τ' οὐσα τυράννων / παίδων τ' οὐκ ἦρθη νοῦν ἐς ἀτασθαλίην.

⁷³ Simonides 41 *FGE* (modified and supplemented): πρόσθε μὲν ἄμφ' ὥμοισιν ἔχων τραχεῖαν ἄσιλλαν / ἰχθὺς ἐξ Ἄργους εἰς Τεγέαν ἔφερον· / [νῦν δὲ κράτος φέρομεν μετὰ πᾶσιν ὀλυμπιονίκαι].

⁷⁴ Bing is right in not implying that it was Plato's intention to incite the Ergänzungsspiel. Bing (1995b: 119).

would, perhaps, still be fair to say that epigram's pre-Hellenistic history is today not much better known than it was when Richard Reitzenstein wrote *Epigramm und Skolion* in 1893. Many subjects deserving much more thorough investigation could only be touched upon here: the orators' use of epigrams, public epigram and propaganda, the implicit poetics of pre-Hellenistic epigram and its evaluation by contemporaries, and the role of professional poets in composing pre-Hellenistic epigram. It is not only possible but indeed probable that such studies will transform our view of the genre's early history.⁷⁵

⁷⁵ I would like to express my gratitude to A. Chaniotis, J.E. Lendon (who also scrutinized my English), and I. Petrovic for their help, suggestions and criticism.

THE MUTUAL INFLUENCE OF INSCRIBED AND LITERARY EPIGRAM*

Anja Bettenworth

The present article, like the moon, has two faces. While the influence of inscribed on literary epigram is visible and familiar, the impact of literary epigrams on inscribed ones remains mostly in the shadows, difficult to detect and hard to approach.¹ The situation is further complicated by the large variety of verse inscriptions present in almost all areas of Hellenistic life: they adorned statues erected in honor of local celebrities, commemorated donors of public buildings or were carved into boundary-stones. Some were scratched on walls by private individuals. Others describe an object, person or event and are generally summarized in the disparate category of “ecphrastic” or “epideictic” epigrams.

Most inscribed epigrams, however, are either funerary or dedicatory. Since these are also popular with Hellenistic poets and at the same time relatively easy to define, they are an ideal starting point for studying the interaction between literary and inscribed epigrams, and I shall focus mainly on them.

A.E. Raubitschek in his discussion of Greek inscriptions² draws a sharp distinction between inscribed epigrams designed for a specific monument, whose message is weakened when separated from it,³ and “notations,” e.g. laws or official edicts that are usually inscribed publicly on stone or metal, but do not lose their binding force when copied to papyrus or other material.⁴ While in the latter case the

* I should like to thank Ruth Scodel and Chad Schroeder for their suggestions and the linguistic emendation of this paper. Any remaining flaws are, of course, entirely mine.

¹ The idea of “epigram” as a genre of poetry seems to develop during the Hellenistic period; see Puelma (1996) and Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 283).

² Raubitschek (1968: 3).

³ Some epigrams may nevertheless have been published both on stone and in a literary collection. Cp. Dioscorides 24 GP, an epitaph for the comic writer Machon, which was, according to “Plutarch” cited in Athenaeus 6.241F, inscribed on a tombstone in Alexandria and has also been included in the *AP* (Gow-Page (1965: 2.257)).

⁴ The “weakening” of an inscription deprived of its monumental context may not

monument is merely a means of publication that can easily be replaced by other forms of communication, in inscribed epigrams the monument is part of the message.

Herein lies both the basic problem and the fascination of literary epigrams: to make them recognizable as epigrams without referring to headings or preliminary explications, poets have to reproduce characteristic features of inscriptions,⁵ while at the same time remodeling them in such a way that the lack of a monumental context, instead of diminishing the quality of the poem, enhances its sophistication.⁶

Poets deal with this inherent tension in several ways. While some detach their poetry completely from any resemblance to monumental inscriptions and preserve only the relatively vague feature of “brevity,” thereby risking a blurring of the epigrammatic character of the poem, others allude continually to the inscriptional form, for example by employing some of its characteristic formulas that developed over the centuries. These formulas, a selection of which is listed below, vary according to the type of epigram.⁷

Inscriptional funerary epigrams

Funerary inscriptions form the largest group of inscribed texts and therefore allow for a close comparison with their literary relatives. The shortest examples consist of merely the name of the deceased in the nominative,⁸ sometimes completed by phrases such as ἐνθάδε κεῖται

always be perceivable to a reader, since the poem may still be witty and in itself noteworthy. Still, once removed from its original context, it no longer fulfills the function it was created for, namely, to commemorate a person or an event in a specific place that is often directly linked to the content of the inscription, e.g. a tomb or a temple. Cf. Bing (1998).

⁵ The thorough imitation of inscriptional patterns is in fact the only certain criterion that allows us to identify a given poem not explicitly labeled by the author as an epigram. The mere length and general topic of a poem, on the other hand, are often not sufficient for identification, since a long epigram may converge in these respects with short elegies. Clear boundaries between the two genres are especially hard to draw and often provide little help for our understanding of the poems.

⁶ The most recent discussion of the reception of inscribed epigrams in Hellenistic literature is Meyer’s intriguing study on Callimachus (2005).

⁷ For a more detailed discussion see Day’s article in this volume.

⁸ Funerary inscriptions that give only the name of the deceased were typical for central Greece, Boeotia and Sicyon, while in Attica the father’s name, the name of the deme (for males) or the name of father and husband (for females) seems to have been the norm (Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 292)). Further details in women’s funerary

("here lies...") or in the genitive (where the reader must supply a term like σῆμα),⁹ while others also provide information about age, family, profession and the person that set up the tombstone.¹⁰ Longer inscriptions also refer to the circumstances of death, especially when they are unusual or pathetic. "Unusual" ways of dying include death on the battlefield,¹¹ during childbirth,¹² by drowning at sea,¹³ by murder¹⁴ or accidents,¹⁵ or generally the premature death of children, especially of girls who did not live to be married and have children.¹⁶ Death by old age or disease, on the other hand, is rarely mentioned in funerary inscriptions.¹⁷

Praise of the deceased's character and a lament may follow, sometimes concluded by good wishes,¹⁸ a prayer for his good standing in the other world, and warnings against possible desecration of the grave.¹⁹ Gnomic expressions also occur frequently in various positions and functions.

ary inscriptions were sometimes regarded excessive (cf. Theophr. *Characters* 13.10 and Hicks (1882: 141–2)).

⁹ Sepulchral inscriptions without any name are mostly limited to either babies who never had a name (e.g., *IG* VII 690–722) or to young people who probably did not have the time to acquire a "name" in society (e.g., *GVI* 89, 790). Other examples include anonymous dead, e.g., sailors drowned at sea and washed up on a foreign shore. For death at sea see Lattimore (1942: 200–1).

¹⁰ For this type see the tombstone for Cladus, below.

¹¹ E.g., *GG* 469 (from Corcyra).

¹² E.g., *GG* 180 (= *GVI* 1353, third century B.C.): πάτρην Ἡράκλειαν, ὁδοιπόροι, ἦν τις ἵκηται, / εἰπεῖν· ὠδίνες παῖδα Πολυκράτεος / ἤγαγον εἰς Αἶδην Ἀγαθόκλειαν· οὐ γὰρ ἔλαφραι / ἦντησαν τέκνου πρὸς φάος ἐρχομένου.

¹³ E.g., *GG* 235 (tomb for a shipwrecked Phoenician woman, 2/3rd century A.D.). See also Georgoudi (1988: 58).

¹⁴ See, e.g., *GG* 160 (second century B.C.) and 478 (first century B.C.).

¹⁵ E.g., *GG* 217 (a boy squeezed to death by a wagon loaded with wine barrels, first century B.C.).

¹⁶ E.g., *GG* 188 (third century B.C.): κεῖσαι δὴ παρὰ μητρὶ Φιλίνῃ, Σιμυλὶ τέκνον, / πατρὶ Λύκωνι λιποῦσα ἡμερόεντα πόθον, / οὔτε γάμον εἶδ' ἑρπύλλον οὔτε ὑμεναῖον· / πρόσθεν γάρ σε Αἶδου δέξατο δῶμα τόδε. See Griessmair (1966).

¹⁷ An exception is the epitaph for Cladus, discussed below, and, e.g., *IG* XII 9,1174 (from Chalkis, third century B.C.), where the old age of the deceased Cleonicus, son of Pheidias, is explicitly mentioned (although no exact age is given). See also *GG* 184 (epitaph from Smyrna for a man named Kriton, third century B.C.), as well as Posidippus 59 and 100 AB in the epitymbia and iamatika of the Milan papyrus.

¹⁸ Occasionally the traditional formula of good wishes to the dead may be perverted and turned into a curse, see, e.g., *AP* 7.401.7–8 (on the tomb of a man called Eunicides): χθὼν [...] ἐπὶ τέφρης / ἀνδρὸς μὴ κούφη κέκλισο μηδ' ὀλίγη. These variants imply, though, that the regular formula was well established at the time.

¹⁹ E.g., *GG* 183 (from Crete, first century B.C.) and 431 (from Phrygia, first century B.C.). A collection of motifs in ancient epitaphs is provided by Lattimore (1942).

All these details can be given either from a neutral speaker's perspective,²⁰ often imagined as the tomb²¹ or a part of it, e.g., a statue,²² by one of the mourners, or even by the dead person himself. If a neutral voice gives the information, the addressee is most commonly the reader of the inscription, sometimes directly referred to as 'stranger' (ξένος) or 'passerby' (ὁδῖτης, ὁδοιπόρος). In other cases it is a goddess like Persephone or Hades.²³ If the inscription is given from a mourner's (usually a relative's) perspective, he (or she) may address either the reader or the deceased person, often reminding him of the sorrow and grief his death caused the survivors.²⁴

If the deceased speaks himself, this changes the presentation of these details. The circumstances of death may be presented as a lament about unfortunate circumstances that led to his destruction²⁵ or, in rare cases, by the first-person narrative of his last moments.²⁶ On the other hand, the dead person may reassure the living that he has accepted his fate (e.g., when he has led a fulfilling life, especially when he has lived to see children and grandchildren).²⁷ He may, nevertheless, ask the wanderer for a prayer or, more generally, to honor his memory.

Different perspectives may also be combined, either in a dialogue between the deceased and a living person (a very popular technique),²⁸ or by simply putting them next to each other without any inner connection. An example is *IG XII* 9.290 (third century B.C.) where we find first an address of a mourner to the deceased, which provides

²⁰ E.g., *CEG* 470. Cp. Cassio (1994) and Scodel (1992: 70).

²¹ This is especially true for archaic inscriptions; see Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 294).

²² Speeches of the the tomb develop as early as the seventh and sixth century B.C.; see Meyer (2005: 70).

²³ E.g., *GVI* 1693 (stele from Demetrias, third century B.C.: address to Rhadamanthus), *IG* 14.1754 (epitaph from Rome, third or second century B.C., address to Hades).

²⁴ E.g., *GVI* 1450 (a man from Ikaria laments the death of his wife and daughter), *IG IX*.2.638 (parents lament the death of their daughter in childbirth).

²⁵ In an inscription found near Ephesus (*CIG* 2.3026) for a person who died from falling down a cliff, the blame for the accident is put on the "counsels of unwise people" without specification.

²⁶ See, e.g., *CEG* 722: Δίφιλος Κούνιος—ἔλιπον φῶς.

²⁷ See *CEG* 601 (for Cydimachus of Athens).

²⁸ An address by the deceased to the wanderer is the older form, while speeches of the passer-by, which are then answered by the dead person, seem to go back to the practice of polyandria, public monuments erected to fallen soldiers (see Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 297)). For a discussion of such dialogues (in epigrammatic and non-epigrammatic literary contexts) see Kassel (1983) and for dialogues in the *AP* Rasche (1910).

the name of the buried person, then two hexameters written from the perspective of the dead but not responding to the speech of the mourner, and finally, in a separate line, again the deceased's name in the nominative.²⁹

Features of funerary inscriptions in Hellenistic literary epigrams

Hellenistic epigrammatists make use of these well-established patterns in a variety of ways.³⁰ While sometimes there are only weak allusions to the inscriptional tradition,³¹ other poems may reproduce the inscriptional form so closely that it is not easy to decide if the epigram now detached from its original way of publication and integrated into an anthology like those of Meleager and Philip was originally carved on a monument or not.³² A well known criterion for distinguishing literary epigrams from real inscriptions is a surplus of information given in the text. While epigrams intended for a real object can function with a minimum of details, since the context against which they must be

²⁹ χαῖρε, Διοδώρου Διόγενες, φὺς δίκαιος καὶ εὐσεβής. / εἰ θεός ἐσθ' ἡ γῆ, κάγῳ θεός εἰμι δικάϊως. / ἐκ γῆς γὰρ βλαστὼν γενόμεν νεκρός, ἐκ δὲ νεκροῦ γῆ. / Διογένης. Inscriptions with the names attached in a separate space can be found from the fifth century onwards, but become popular in the fourth century, especially in Attica; see Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 295).

³⁰ *Variatio* as a general feature of Hellenistic poetry is especially dominant in literary epigrams of the era; see Tarán (1979).

³¹ Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 301–2) assume, for example, that the lack of the dead person's name in a funerary epigram by Asclepiades (*AP* 13.23 = 33 GP), which is obviously not due to metrical inconvenience, mirrors a well known inscriptional tradition dating back to the fourth century, according to which the name of the deceased was placed on the tombstone apart from the metrical inscription. See also Bing (1998: 34–39). There may, however, be other reasons to omit a name; see below on the epitaph of Callimachus and the funerary inscription of Alceionis.

³² There is no doubt that the *Garland* of Meleager contained literary epigrams along with inscriptional ones. The theory that some of these were copied by Meleager himself on his journeys to various locations was put forward by Hecker, apud Weißhäupl, *op. cit.* below, who relied among other pieces of evidence on two lemmata that are transmitted in the manuscripts (*AP* 9.436: ταῦτα τὰ ἐπιγράμματα ἐν Συρακούσαις ἐγράφησαν and 7.657: Εἰς Κλειταγόρου τινὸς τάφον παρὰ τινα ἀκρόρειαν κείμενον, ἐν ἧ ποιμένες μετὰ προβάτων διατρίβουσιν. Νομίζω δὲ ὅτι ἐν Ἐφέσῳ κείται ταῦτα). Hecker's theory is rejected by Weißhäupl (1889: 29–31). The *Garland* of Philip, on the other hand, apparently does not contain similar lemmata (Weißhäupl (1889: 30–1)). Today it is generally assumed that Meleager draws on earlier collections, although it is possible “that the editions used by Meleager were already contaminated with additions from a variety of sources, including, possibly, genuine inscriptions” (Gutzwiller (1998b: 91, n. 110)).

read is provided by the monument, a literary epigram that lacks such a context often includes information about the situation in which it is to be imagined, while other details that occur frequently in inscriptions may be left out.³³ There are, however, exceptions from this rule, such as a dedicatory inscription for Artemis Ortheia found in Messene and containing a description of the statue it accompanies.³⁴ The line between literary and inscribed epigrams is, therefore, sometimes hard to draw. An example is Leonidas of Tarentum 12 GP (= AP 7.448).

Πραταλίδα τὸ μνήμα Λυκαστίῳ, ἄκρον ἐρώτων
 εἰδότος, ἄκρα μάχας, ἄκρα λινοστασίης,
 ἄκρα χοροῖτυπής. χθόνιοι³⁵
 τοῦτον Κρηταιεῖς Κρήτα παρφύσσετε.

This is the memorial of Pratalidas of Lycastus, who knew the ways of love to perfection, battle to perfection, hunting (nets) to perfection, dancing to perfection. You have made this Cretan, Cretan chthonic (gods), your neighbor.

The poem recalls some formulas familiar from inscribed epitaphs. As in many inscriptions, τὸ μνήμα is mentioned in the first line with the definite article taking the function of a deictic pronoun, and the name of the deceased and his place of origin attached to it in the genitive. An enumeration of his outstanding qualities follows, closed by an invocation to the deities of the underworld who are said to have let Pratalidas dwell next to them. There is no mention of the person who set up the tombstone, the cause of death, or the age of Pratalidas.³⁶

The most striking feature of the list is the repetition of the words ἄκρον or ἄκρα, appearing prominently after the bucolic diairesis in

³³ See Köhnken (1973) on Callimachus 22 GP (dedication of an oaken club to Heracles) and Callimachus 28 GP (dedication of a salt-tub to the Cabiri) and cp. Weber (1917). Laurens (1989: 39) suggests that satirical sepulchral epigrams should be regarded as literary productions. But since satirical elements, especially self-ironizing, can sometimes be found on real tombstones, this criterion is not in itself sufficient.

³⁴ See Themelis (1994).

³⁵ The second half of the verse is missing in the manuscript (P), and various opinions have been ventured about how to fill in the gap. If the extant text is correct, it seems, however, that no substantial piece of information is missing. The half verse may therefore have contained some detail to complete χθόνιοι or an addition like Μινώϊσιν ἔδραας as suggested by Gow-Page (1965: 2.323) with reference to Prop. 4.11.21: *Minoida sellam* (or *Minoida sella*).

³⁶ The reference to battle in the list of Pratalidas' abilities suggests, however, that he was at least an ephebe, old enough to go to war.

the first verse, in the first half of the pentameter and directly after the diairesis in the second, and at the beginning of the line in the third. Unlike other deceased persons, whose shortcomings are sometimes mentioned to emphasize their qualities in other respects, Pratalidas excels in many different fields of life: not only is he is a perfect lover, but also a perfect warrior, hunter and dancer.

The repeated forms of ἄκρον, while in themselves not impossible on a funerary inscription, draw the reader's attention to a similar repetition of related words in the last verse, the only one that is not explicitly concerned with the achievements of the deceased.³⁷ In a prominent position right before and after the pentameter's diairesis, we read Κρηταιεὺς Κρήτηα, the first word referring to the Cretan chthonic deities, the second to the nationality of Pratalidas. The emphasis on Crete is puzzling because the hometown of the dead had already been mentioned in the very first line: Pratalidas is from Lycastus, a small town near Cnossus.

Since Lycastus was a minor settlement,³⁸ the stress on Pratalidas' Cretan origin would be perfectly understandable if he was buried in a distant region where the average reader of the inscription could not be expected to know where Lycastus was located. There is, however, nothing in the epigram to suggest a foreign burial place, which is otherwise often mentioned in sepulchral inscriptions.³⁹ On the contrary, the emphasis on the chthonic character of the Cretan gods, who are imagined to have taken Pratalidas "as their neighbor," suggests that his tomb is to be imagined either on or near the island of Crete,⁴⁰ which renders the repetition of Crete superfluous as a geographic indicator.

Instead, the deceased's Cretan nationality is stressed to bring Pratalidas who excelled among mortals in close connection to the

³⁷ Peter Bing suggests to me that there is an implicit assertion of Pratalidas' excellence in the last: the notable assonance between *akra* and *kreta* suggests that perfection/excellence and Cretan ethnicity are synonymous. In addition, excellence is implicit in the name *Pratalidas* (Doric *Prāta* for *prōta*, a touch of Cretan dialectal coloring).

³⁸ See Gow-Page (1965: 2.323).

³⁹ See, e.g., *GG* 135 (tomb of an Alexandrian physician who died in Tithorea (Phocis); 146 (a tombstone for an Arcadian who died in Sparta and was then buried there); 227 (= *GVI* 1506 = Diogenes Laertius 4.31) (epitaph for a Phrygian slave which stresses that his native land is far away); 437 (an inscription from Herakleopolis for a woman from Naukratis). Cp. also Selden (1998).

⁴⁰ The adjective χθόνιος, combining the meanings of both "underworldly" and "native," is carefully placed between the penthemimeral and the hephthemimeral caesurae, reflecting its importance for the context.

gods. Rhadamanthus and Minos, the judges of the underworld,⁴¹ are traditionally believed to be Cretans like Pratalidas, and they, so the inscription suggests, will gladly accept their excellent compatriot at their side. If read as a claim for a special position in the underworld, the pleonastic geographical indication serves a purpose that works both in an inscription and in a literary poem.

But how exactly are we to interpret this claim? If the poem was carved on a tombstone and displayed in a cemetery, there is little doubt the excessive praise is to be taken seriously. If, however, the poem is a literary play, an ironic reading is possible: Pratalidas' Cretan identity may be held against him, because Cretans were, in ancient Greek thought, notorious liars.⁴² Since the epigram does not contain any signs of mourning, the text alone does not tell us whether "you Cretan Gods have made this Cretan your neighbor" is the praise of an admirer or rather a sigh of relief from a rival. We need, therefore, additional evidence.

A hint comes from the following, clearly non-ironic poem by Leonidas (AP 7.449 = 13 GP) on the same Pratalidas (identified by his name, his hometown and his achievements in love and hunting), who is, in a question, called blest (πῶς οὐκ εὐαίων ὁ Λυκάστιος..., 3). This second epigram not only proves that Pratalidas had reached the status of a literary motif, but it also suggests a serious reading of the first epigram. This example shows how the context of an epigram within a collection may to a certain extent guide or force our interpretation.

The potential for recontextualization and, as a consequence, for double entendres of this kind is a characteristic feature of epigrams that circulate in literary form (even if they were originally conceived as inscriptions). In this respect, it does not matter much if the epigram was originally inscribed and later included in a collection of epigrams, as some of the poems in the *AP* surely were. Once it enters the literary tradition, it is open to re-invention by variation or by the context in which it is placed.

⁴¹ Although Rhadamanthus, son of Zeus and Europa and brother of Minos and Sarpedon, is already mentioned in Hom. *Il.* 14.323; Hom. *Od.* 7.321–2 and Hes. fr. 141 M.-W., he first appears in Plato (cp. esp. *Gorg.* 523e) as a judge of the dead, where he shares this role with Minos and Aeacus. Minos appears as early as Hom. *Od.* 11.568–71 as judging the shadows of the deceased.

⁴² See Callimachus *Hy.* 1.8, a phrase that goes back to Epimenides (sixth century), which is in turn modelled on Hes. *Theog.* 26f.; see Hopkinson (1988: 123).

A surfeit of information characterizes also an epigram by Philetas of Samos about a girl named Theiodote who died in childhood. Here, the epigrammatic voice mediates between the monument and the reader of the epigram (2 *GP* = *AP* 7.481):

‘Α στάλα βάρυθουσα λέγει τάδε· ‘Τὸν μινύωρον,
τὸν μικκὸν Ἀΐδας ἄρπασε Θειοδόταν.’
χὰ μικκὰ τάδε πατρὶ λέγει πάλιν· “Ἴσχεο λύπας,
Θειόδοτε· θνατοὶ πολλάκι δυστυχέες.’

With a heavy heart the tombstones speaks thus: “The short-lived, little Theiodote—Hades snatched her away.”
And the little girl answers her father: “Stop mourning, Theiodotus. Mortals are often unhappy.”

In this poem, the short direct speeches do not in and of themselves necessarily point to a funerary inscription, even if similar themes are frequently found on tombstones. It could easily be considered a discussion between two living persons, embedding a well known gnome. Only the fact that a stele is introduced as a speaker informs us that we are to imagine a tomb on which the first direct speech is written. Clearly, an introduction of this kind would be unnecessary in a real monument. When answering the lament (3: *χὰ μικκὰ τάδε* [...] *λέγει*), from her grave, though, the little girl does not address the stele, as one might expect, but her previously unmentioned father. Again, this information cannot be inferred from the direct speech, in which the girl calls Theiodotus only by his name without indicating the nature of their relationship, but only from the epigrammatic voice that introduces it. The stress on *πάλιν* put directly before the bucolic diairesis and the parallel structure of the two main clauses (*‘Α στάλα* [...] *λέγει* ~ *χὰ μικκὰ* [...] *πατρὶ λέγει*) invites the reader to consider both together and to identify the stele’s words with the thoughts of Theiodotus who had probably erected the tombstone. By leaving the key to a full understanding of the “inscription” with an anonymous voice, Philetas skillfully highlights the incompleteness characteristic of inscribed epigrams.

At the same time, the direct speech of the little girl imagined as communicating with her father without the intercession of the stele criticizes permanent mourning. While she does not seem to reject inscriptions as such, she speaks out against pathetic ones that will, as memorials set up for eternity, eternalize feelings of sorrow shared by many mortals. An alternative, although not explicitly mentioned, would be a more

rational epitaph that gives specific information about the deceased and/or the survivors. A well known motif of consolation (the reference to the *conditio humana*)⁴³ is, by its way of presentation, given a specific twist that criticizes not only the feelings of the mourner, but particularly his decision to eternalize his grief by means of the stele.

Callimachus takes the idea of an epigram's incompleteness even further in his epitaphs for his father (29 GP = AP 7.525 = 21 Pf.) and himself (30 GP = AP 7.415 = 35 Pf.). The poems form companion pieces that have often been studied.⁴⁴ The text reads:

ὅστις ἐμὸν παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις πόδα Καλλιμάχου με
ἴσθι Κυρηναίου παῖδά τε καὶ γενέτην.
εἰδείης δ' ἄμφω κεν· ὁ μὲν κοτε πατρίδος ὄπλων
ἦρξεν, ὁ δ' ἤεισεν κρέσσονα βασκανίης.
οὐ νέμεσις, Μοῦσαι γὰρ ὅσους ἴδον ὄμματι παῖδας
†ἄχρι βίου† πολιοῦς οὐκ ἀπέθεντο φίλους.⁴⁵

Whoever you are who are passing by my grave, know that I am both
the son and the father of a Callimachus of Cyrene.
You might know both of them: The first was once the first man of his
hometown in war,
the other one sang better than ill will.
No envy: whom the Muses looked upon as a friend in childhood,
they do not desert when his hair is grey.

Βαττιάδεω παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις πόδας εὖ μὲν ἀοιδὴν
εἰδότος, εὖ δ' οἶνφ καίρια συγγελάσαι.

You are passing by the grave of the son of Battus, who knew well the
art of song,
and well he knew to laugh with the others about a good joke at the
symposion.⁴⁶

In both cases, a vital piece of information, the name of the deceased person (Battus or Callimachus), is left out, and must be supplied from its companion piece. Incompleteness, normally a feature of real inscriptional epigram, is here taken to an extreme. While real inscriptions usually lack information that can be easily inferred from the environ-

⁴³ See, e.g., *GG* 437.3 for a parallel.

⁴⁴ See most recently Meyer (2005: 176–8), Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 297–9), Scodel (2003a), Bing (1995b), Livrea (1992), and Köhnken (1973), who provide a bibliography on the subject.

⁴⁵ There have been various suggestions on the emendation of the last line. See Scodel (2003a: 257, n. 1).

⁴⁶ For this translation of καίρια συγγελάσαι see Köhnken (1973).

ment (such as the shape and location of the tombstone, and ornaments, pictures or sculptures with which it is decorated), and Philetas introduces a voice that fills in the gaps, the missing information is not provided within Callimachus' poem, and is, furthermore, of a kind that could not easily be supplied by any work of art. Instead, the reader is forced to gather the missing information from a second literary source.⁴⁷ The literary character of the poems is, ironically, stressed by their very incompleteness, usually a characteristic of their inscriptional counterparts.

Sometimes even inscribed epigrams play with the possibility of incompleteness. An inscription from Miletus (*GV* 1344) from the third or second century B.C. reads:

τὴν ὀσίην χαίρειμ πολίτιδες εἶπατε Βάκχαι
 ἱρεῖν· χρηστὴ τοῦτο γυναικὶ θέμις.
 ὑμᾶς κεῖς ὄρος ἦγε καὶ ὄργια πάντα καὶ ἱρά
 ἤνεικεμ πάσης ἐρχομένη πρὸ πόλεως.
 τοῦνομα δ' εἴ τις ξεῖνος ἀνείρεται, Ἀλκμειωνίς
 ἡ Ῥοδίου, καλῶμ μοῖραν ἐπισταμένη.

Greet the pious priestess, Bacchae of this city.
 This is fitting for a virtuous woman.
 She used to lead you up to the mountain and carried all the secret and
 holy objects,
 proceeding in front of the whole town.
 But if a stranger asks for her name: Alcmeionis,
 the daughter of Rhodios, who knew her share of good things.

The first four lines focus on the Milesian residents, who are reminded of the deceased person's service as a chief priestess. Emphasis is put on how she led the Dionysian priestesses to the mountain and carried the holy objects "in front of the whole town." Her name, however, is not mentioned until line 5, where the Bacchae of Miletus are advised to answer any stranger who might ask about it. The implication is clear: only a stranger will ask about the identity of this outstanding personality, while locals will recognize her by the description of the office she held.

⁴⁷ The situation would not change much if we were to imagine the epitaphs on, say, two adjacent tombstones (see Bing (1995b)). Even in this case, the missing information is gained by reading the companion piece, not by looking at the monument. Examples for multiple and sometimes complementary inscriptions on a single tombstone, although not of the sophisticated nature of Callimachean companion pieces, have been collected by Peek (*GV* 1888–2015); cp. Rossi (2001: 12).

This example shows how postponing a name (the crucial part of a funerary inscription) or pretending it was given only to accomodate strangers, could be considered a means of stressing the lasting fame of a well known character. This technique is often found in Hellenistic epigrams.

Callimachus' epitaphs, on the other hand, demand basic knowledge of his family's history in order to be recognized as companion pieces.⁴⁸ They address the reader in very general terms without distinction between locals and strangers. Since everyone gets the same amount of information, everyone is obviously expected to possess the necessary knowledge to identify the deceased. In other words: the priestess is famous among locals, while Callimachus claims to be famous everywhere.⁴⁹

In many cases, literary epigrams are linked to inscriptions not by their form, but merely by their content. An example is Callimachus 53 GP (= *AP* 7.471 = 23 Pf.) on Cleombrotus of Ambracia, who allegedly committed suicide after reading Plato's *Phaedo*. The story is related by several later authors,⁵⁰ and in Callimachus' version reads as follows:

Εἶπας, Ἥλιε χαῖρε, Κλεόμβροτος ὠμβρακιώτης
ἦλσθ' ὅφ' ὑψηλοῦ τείχεος εἰς Ἄϊδην,
ἄξιον οὐδὲν ἰδὼν θανάτου κακὸν ἀλλὰ Πλάτωνος
ἐν τὸ περὶ ψυχῆς γράμμ' ἀναλεξάμενος.

"Farewell, sunlight," said Cleombrotus of Ambracia
and leapt from a high wall to Hades,
not because he had seen any evil worthy of death, but because
he had read that one book of Plato's on the soul.

Here, Callimachus pokes fun at an unexpected effect of Plato's *Phaedo*, which, although not justifying suicide, reassures readers that there is an afterlife often preferable to life on earth. A certain Cleombrotus draws extreme conclusions from this philosophical argument and

⁴⁸ In fact, Cameron (1995: 79) suggests that the two poems are to be read independently, 29 GP as a literary polemic and 30 GP as a sympotic epigram.

⁴⁹ The fame of both is narratologically stressed by the fact that neither the Milesians nor the passerby in Callimachus' epitaphs are openly expected to ask questions, while *GV* 1344 on Alcmeionis assumes that strangers might wonder about the identity of the deceased.

⁵⁰ E.g., Cic. *Tusc.* 1.84; *pro Scauro* 4; Ov. *Ib.* 493; Lact. *Div. Inst.* 3.18.9; Aug. *Civ. Dei* 1.22, see on the reception of the story in general White (1994) and Gutzwiller (1998b: 205) with further bibliography.

jumps to his death.⁵¹ By stressing that he had, in reality, “not seen anything evil worthy of death,” the poet implicitly contrasts the traditional motivation for suicide discussed in philosophy and sometimes mentioned on tombstones (as a rescue from unbearable conditions)⁵² with the choice of Cleombrotus whom Plato led into believing that his good life was unbearable compared to what he might experience in the other world.

At first glance, therefore, the epigram centers around a fatal misunderstanding. The point of the epigram, however, cannot lie only in the fact that the *Phaedo* was misleading, in which case ἔν, although prominently placed at the beginning of the last verse, would assume a weak meaning (“that one-volume work”) or be redundant. Rather, it seems to stress that Cleombrotus misinterprets Plato because he had read only that one single work. Even this reading cannot have been diligent, though, since the *Phaedo* contains a warning against suicide (61c: οὐ μέντοι ἴσως βιάσεται αὐτόν· οὐ γάρ φασι θεμιτὸν εἶναι) except for very limited cases in which a philosopher might infer that a god actually wants him to die.⁵³ This is also the way Augustine reads the story, who points out that Cleombrotus showed courage but not wisdom and criticizes him for not studying Plato closely.⁵⁴ In fact, the *Phaedo* promises a happy afterlife only for those who have led a pure and righteous life on earth, while all others will have to endure punishment of various degrees according to their previous behaviour. In this reading the unlearned Cleombrotus, while pursuing eternal happiness, acts against divine law as described in the *Phaedo* and therefore cannot hope for a better fate in the other world.

His lack of a thorough education is also suggested by the bombastic address Ἥλιε χαῖρε, whose epic color is in stark contrast to his unheroic way of dying. Hurling oneself down from a wall is neither appropriate

⁵¹ Gutzwiller (1998b: 205) suggests that the name Cleombrotus alludes to the companion of the hedonistic philosopher Aristippus, mentioned at *Phaedo* 59c.

⁵² See Lattimore (1942: 206–9). The idea of escaping from an unpleasant situation is stressed by the wordplay Ἀίδην—ιδών: A normal candidate for suicide tries to free himself from an unbearable “sight” by taking refuge in Hades, the place of not-seeing.

⁵³ 62c: ἴσως τοίνυν ταύτῃ οὐκ ἄλογον μὴ πρότερον αὐτὸν ἀποκτείνονα δεῖν, πρὶν ἀνάγκην τινὰ θεὸς ἐπιτέμψῃ, ὥσπερ καὶ τὴν νῦν ἡμῖν παρούσαν.

⁵⁴ Aug. *civ.* 1.22. It is not certain if Augustine, who speaks of a Theombrotus instead of Cleombrotus, refers directly to Callimachus or if he learned about the story from some other source. The variant of the name might well be due to a slip of mind, since Augustine often quotes his sources by heart.

for an epic hero (who would rather be expected to fall on his sword), nor is it, more surprisingly, in any way connected to the *Phaedo*, which brings to mind poisoning rather than leaping to one's death. At the same time, the farewell to the sunlight, which is usually uttered with an undertone of sorrow reflecting the belief in a dark and gloomy realm of the dead, is at odds with the alleged hope of Cleombrotus to find a better life in death.

Callimachus is, however, less clear about how exactly the *Phaedo* triggered Cleombrotus' suicide than later sources. Cicero for instance insists that he died *non quod acerbitalis accepisset aliquid, sed, ut video scriptum apud Graecos, cum summi philosophi Platonis graviter et ornate scriptum librum de morte legisset...* (*pro Scauro* 4) and then goes on to summarize Socrates' attitude towards death. It is clear from *Tusc.* 1.84 that Cicero means Callimachus when he refers to his Greek sources (although he changed the Callimachean text), and his summary may shed light on Callimachus' epigram. While Cicero claims that Cleombrotus had experienced "no bitterness at all," Callimachus says only that he had seen "no evil worthy of death," leaving open the possibility that the *Phaedo* was indeed a κακόν, just not one worth dying for.

This interpretation is supported by the way Callimachus avoids the title *Phaedo* (which is well attested in his time and offers no metrical difficulties), and which resembles the derogatory practice of pretending to ignore or to have forgotten the name of a *persona non grata*.⁵⁵ If seen in this light, Cleombrotus jumped into the abyss because he couldn't stand the *Phaedo* as such, be it for its content or its literary quality.

This interpretation with its semi-serious implications provides a link to comedy, where we indeed find a parallel for Cleombrotus' way of dying. In the *Frogs*, Dionysus and Heracles look for a fast and convenient way to Hades, and after rejecting strangulation and poisoning because of their unpleasant side-effects consider hurling themselves from a high tower. While this method has, in Heracles' view, the advantage of being a fast way of dying, Dionysus refuses it, because it will destroy his brains (117–135). A reader who remembers this scene might view Cleombrotus as someone who, while trying to be quick and efficient, pursues an inappropriate goal with comically inappropriate means.

⁵⁵ Note, though, that Cicero, in *Tusc.* 1.11.24 also avoids the Greek name *Phaedo*, probably in an effort to give his treatise a more Roman flavor.

At the same time, the references to Hades (2) and the motif of bidding farewell to the light of day (1) are, together with the brevity of the poem, features shared by many funerary inscriptions.⁵⁶ The resemblances might lead the reader to expect a closure similar to those found on tombstones. But instead of commemorating people and events from Cleombrotus' personal sphere, as a private sepulchral inscription probably would, the poet offers an intricate closure open to several interpretations ranging from questions of the thoroughness of Cleombrotus' education to the devastating effects of misleading philosophical literature.

The surplus of information that lies in such expressions as ἐν τὸ περὶ ψυχῆς γράμμα and ἄξιον οὐδὲν ἰδὼν θανάτου κακόν and, in combination with other details, opens the poem to more than one interpretation, also leads to the conclusion that the epigram is not designed as a real inscription.

Dedicatory epigrams

The need for a surplus of information is felt even more in dedicatory poems which may, in contrast to funerary inscriptions, accompany a wide range of objects and often reveal their full meaning only when the reader knows for what kind of *ex voto* they are designed.

The great variety of dedicatory epigrams corresponds to the diversity of votive objects,⁵⁷ which makes it even more difficult to generalize their features.⁵⁸ If they are offered as an *ex voto* (i.e., as a sign of gratitude for divine help in crises such as illness, war, and financial or personal anxieties) they may bear no more than a short indication of gratitude, sometimes supplemented by the name of the dedicator in the nominative and/or the name of the god in the dative.⁵⁹ Further details about the crisis the god averted may be added in a participial

⁵⁶ See for references to Hades, e.g., *GG* 159; for the idea, on tombstones, that light means life while the realm of the dead is a dark and shady place (present in Greek literature from the earliest times), see Lattimore (1942: 162–3).

⁵⁷ Archeological findings include weapons and pieces of armor as well as representations of human limbs, votive tablets (πίνακες), personal objects (such as lamps), and statues of different sizes.

⁵⁸ For further discussion, see Day in this volume.

⁵⁹ In archaic dedicatory inscriptions, the name of the god is often left out, but “the dedicatory epigrams of the Palatine Anthology hardly omit the name of the god” (Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 302)).

construction attached to the name of the dedicator (such as σωθεὶς ἐκ...) or in a relative clause attached to the god's name, or they may be implied in the god's epithet.⁶⁰ In other cases, the inscription does not mention the reason for the dedication at all, which can sometimes be inferred from the monument.⁶¹ Other inscriptions give elaborate accounts of miraculous healings that may be partly inspired by the prose narratives carved in stone by priests in sanctuaries like that of Asclepius in Epidaurus.⁶²

As with funerary inscriptions, the information may be given in the third person (for example, by the offering individual), or in the first person by the item that is dedicated.⁶³ The latter form is especially frequent when the object represents an animal or another living creature. Parallel to the development of funerary inscriptions, these direct speeches may develop into a dialogue between the dedicated object and the stranger who contemplates it.

Just as with funerary epigrams, the character of dedicatory epigrams changes when they are written for literary circulation and therefore lack any monumental context. A famous example is provided by Callimachus ep. 25 GP (= AP 6.149 = 56 Pf.) in which a bronze rooster, dedicated to the Dioscuri in commemoration of a victory in a cock-fight, presents himself to the spectator:

φησὶν ὃ με στήσας Εὐαίνετος—οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε
 γινώσκω—νίκης ἀντί με τῆς ἰδίας
 ἀγκεῖσθαι χάλκειον ἀλέκτορα Τυνδαρίδῃσι.
 πιστεύω Φαίδρου παιδί Φιλοξενίδεω.

Euainetus, who put me up, says—for I of course
 don't know—that I, a bronze rooster, am dedicated
 because of my own victory, to the Dioscuri.
 I believe the son of Phaedrus, son of Philoxenus.

The inscription skilfully explores the tension between the tradition of speaking objects and the fact that these inanimate pieces of art possess

⁶⁰ E.g., *IG* II 3.4714: inscription from Piraeus for εὐαντῇ ἱατρὶνῃ Ἀφροδίτῃ (Aphrodite as a midwife).

⁶¹ Cf. *IG* IX 2.146: Φιλόμβροτος, Ἀφθόνητος Δεινομάχου Ποσειδῶν[ι]. The inscription, which was found in Phthiotic Thebes and dates back to the second century B.C., is supplemented by a relief featuring two threads of hair. Only the illustration makes it clear that the inscription commemorates a ritual hair-offering, designed to put the dedicator under the protection of a specific god, in this case, Poseidon.

⁶² See Bing (2004: 282).

⁶³ See Burzachechi (1962).

no knowledge or consciousness. The responsibility for the correctness of the information is laid upon the human dedicator, while the cock admits that he does not know why he was set up.

At the same time, ironically, he exhibits a mental capacity as complex as trust. This contrast sheds a dubious light on the reliability of the inscription as a whole, but, sophisticated as it may be, it does not necessarily hint at a literary context. Rather, the decisive clue is again given by the surplus of information contained in the self-presentation as a bronze cock (3: *χάλκειον ἀλέκτορα*), a fact that anyone who looked at a real votive offering would have easily recognized.⁶⁴

The influence of literary epigram on inscribed epigram

While the influence of the more formalized types of inscribed on literary epigrams is relatively easy to determine because of the firmly established epigraphic formulas,⁶⁵ it is considerably more difficult to trace literary influences on inscribed epigrams. First, while the use of inscriptional patterns can be recognized as such without identifying a specific inscription as its source, this does not hold true for the use of literary models in inscribed epigrams. Since Greek (and Roman) epigrammatists did not develop neatly identifiable characteristics of “literary” inscriptions,⁶⁶ our knowledge of their influence on inscribed epigram is mainly limited to obvious thematic parallels and verbal quotations of a literary model on a given monument. The length of these verbal quotations varies from a key word in the same metrical position to entire verses or couplets.⁶⁷ Hence, in many cases the mere

⁶⁴ Inscribed epigrams may also occasionally mention the material the votive statue consists of, but in these cases it is usually to stress the costly metal (like silver or gold) or to apologize for not being able to offer a more precious gift.

⁶⁵ Difficulties arise when we take into consideration the large varieties of graffiti that occur, often with a sympotic or erotic content, e.g. on cups or on house walls (or other perishable material) and that may have contributed to the development of literary love-epigrams. See Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 285–7).

⁶⁶ In the Hellenistic period, noticeably longer, more detailed descriptions of a monument, its setting, and the circumstances of death or dedication become more common, and may be a result of the literary-epigrammatic fancy for surplus information. This, of course, makes it more difficult to ascertain whether what has come to us as a literary epigram might have originally been inscribed.

⁶⁷ A special case are secondary inscriptions of originally literary epigrams, such as that by Leonidas of Tarentum (*AP* 6.13 = 46 GP) at the Casa degli Epigrammi in Pompeii. Cp. Bing (1998) and Prioux (2002).

observation that an expression used in an inscribed epigram can also be found in a literary one will not yield sufficient proof of interdependence. To exclude the possibility that such a repetition is due to an identical topic (this holds especially true for funerary epigrams which often focus on stock motifs like lament, consolation, and praise of the deceased), we may have to look for other quotations on stone from the same literary work and possibly employed in the same geographical region. This work has so far only partly been undertaken: for the most part the relevant pieces of information are scattered in archeological and philological publications, while a systematic and comprehensive evaluation remains a desideratum.⁶⁸

A few examples will suffice to illustrate the difficulties. On a marble base from Hadrianoi pros Olympon (near modern Serceler and Orhaneli in Turkey) dated to Hellenistic or early Imperial times we read the following epitaph (*SGO* 08/08/10):⁶⁹

τίς τίνος ἦν εἶρη, Κλάδος οὔνομα· καὶ τίς ὁ θρέψας;
 Μηνόφιλος· Ἰ θνήσκω δ' ἐκ τίνος; ἐκ πυρετοῦ.
 καπὸ πόσων ἐτέων; τρισκαίδεκα. ἀρά γ' ἄμουνος;
 οὐ τέλειον, Μούσαις δ' οὐ μέγα φειλάμενος,
 ἔξοχα δ' Ἑρμεία μεμελημένος· ἐν γὰρ ἁγῶσιν ἰ
 πολλάκις αἰνητὸν στέμμα ἰ πάλας ἔλαχον· ἰ
 Ἀπφία ἢ θάψασα δ' ἐμὴ τροφός, ἰ ἥ μοι ἔτευξεν
 εἰκόνα καὶ τύμβω σῆμ' ἐπέθηκε τόδε.

If you ask, “Who and whose son are you?”—My name is Cladus—and:
 “Who brought you up?”
 —Menophilos—But because of what did I die?—of fever.

⁶⁸ A recent example for the influence of literary epigrams on an inscription is the praise of Halicarnassus found in 1994 still *in situ* and dated to the second century B.C. (Isager 1998). The inscription is in elegiac couplets, the most common meter for epigrams, but because of its length of 60 lines it is doubtful whether it should be considered an epigram (the genre of the inscription and its models are discussed by D'Alessio (2004: 43–4)). Designed as a decoration of Halicarnassus' seashore, it gives an enumeration of all the things the city could be proud of. Among them is a series of mythic heroes (15ff.) and famous writers (42–55). The inscription contains a great number of allusions to literary texts, among them epigrams by Meleager of Gadara (whose catalogue poem *AP* 4.1 is a likely model for the inscription) and the works of Callimachus (cp. Isager (2004: 225–6) and D'Alessio (2004: 43–5)). The references to famous literary texts are especially appropriate in an inscription that exalts a city for the famous writers it produced. Since the inscription pretends to answer to a person who had “never heard” of the city of Halicarnassus (3–4), it also underscores the city's claim for fame.

⁶⁹ Merkelbach and Stauber (1998–2004: 2.121).

—And at what age?—thirteen (years). “You were alien to the Muses?”
 —Not completely. I was not a big friend of the Muses,
 but especially dear to Hermes: In competitions
 I often gained the praiseworthy wreath for wrestling.
 Apphia, who buried me, was my nurse.
 She put up my picture and erected this tombstone on the grave.

As Merkelbach-Stauber point out, the epitaph resembles a funerary epigram by Leonidas (70 GP = *AP* 7.163) on Prexo of Samos, from which it seems to borrow some expressions and lines of thought. Leonidas’ poem runs as follows:

τίς τίνος εὔσα, γύναι, Παρίην ὑπὸ κίονα κεῖσαι;
 Πρηξῶ Καλλιτέλεως.—Καὶ ποδαπή;—Σαμίη.
 Τίς δέ σε καὶ κτερείξε;—Θεόκριτος, ὃ με γονῆες
 ἐξέδοσαν.—Θνήσκεις δ’ ἐκ τίνος; ἐκ τοκετοῦ.
 Εὔσα πόσων ἐτέων; Δύο κεῖκοσιν.—Ἡ ρά γ’ ἄτεκνος;
 οὐκ, ἀλλὰ τριετὴ Καλλιτέλῃν ἔλιπον.
 Ζῶοι σοι κείνός γε καὶ ἐς βαθὺ γῆρας ἵκοιτο.
 καὶ σοί, ξεῖνε, πόροι πάντα Τύχῃ τὰ καλά.

Who and whose daughter are you, woman, who lies under a Parian stele?

—Prexo, the daughter of Calliteles.—And where are you from? I am a Samian.

And who buried you?—Theocritus, to whom my parents gave me (in marriage). What did you die of?—Of childbirth

—At what age?—Twenty-two.—So you were surely childless?

—No, but I left three year old Calliteles behind.

—May he live, as you would wish, and proceed far into old age.

—And also to you, stranger, may Fortune give all good things.

Both poems consist of four elegiac distichs and form a dialogue between the reader of the inscription and the dead person, presenting the name and relations of the deceased as well as the cause of death, age and further characteristics that differ according to the age and sex of the deceased (boy vs. adult woman).

While the identical opening question τίς τίνος, a standard formula since the Homeric epics and frequently found in funerary inscriptions, is less significant for establishing a relationship between the two, line 2 and following of the inscribed and line 4 and following of the literary epigram seem indeed to suggest a connection. In identical metrical position directly before and after the diairesis of the pentameter, we find first a question about the cause of death (θνήσκω δ’ ἐκ τίνος; Θνήσκεις δ’ ἐκ τίνος) and then, in an almost identical wording, the deceased person’s

answer (ἐκ πυρετοῦ; ἐκ τοκετοῦ), a similarity further stressed by the identical endings of πυρετοῦ and τοκετοῦ at the end of the verse.

The following hexameter also runs along parallel lines of thought in both poems, first giving the age of the dead and then proceeding to the stranger's last question: ἄρά γ' ἄμουσος; Ἥ ῥά γ' ἄτεκνος; Again, the most striking similarity is established by two words of identical beginning and ending, prominently placed at the end of the hexameter. Both questions suggest that the deceased lacked a specific positive quality (love of the Muses; children), but are rejected by the dead, with the negation οὐ(κ) emphatically put at the beginning of the next verse. Both then eagerly proceed to extol their qualities. While it is true that Cladus was not a close friend of the Muses, he was favoured by Hermes and won many prizes in athletic games. And while it is true that Prexo died in childbirth, she left behind a son of three years (a fact that, *ex silentio*, suggests that the newborn died with her).

The identical wordings and metrical positions as well as the similar lines of thought, while closely linking the two poems, cannot conceal, however, that the literary epigram presents a more straightforward way of thinking than the inscribed one. Whereas the question Ἥ ῥά γ' ἄτεκνος; is convincingly motivated by the previous information (Prexo was young and died in childbirth), there is no direct inner connection between the age of Cladus and his being ἄμουσος—a quality that can apply to young and old alike. In a thirteen-year-old, the inquiry surely aims at his performance at school,⁷⁰ but the question could have easily been formulated in a different way to obtain the desired information (“Were you a smart pupil?” for example).

Rather than assuming that Leonidas imitated and thereby emended the inscription's somewhat contorted line of thought, it seems more likely that the author of the epitaph borrowed some felicitous expressions from Leonidas and adapted them to his own needs, thereby weakening the coherence of the dialogue.

However likely this assumption might be, caution is still necessary when introducing this or similar examples as proof for direct influence of literary on inscribed epigram. First of all, it is plausible but by no means certain that Leonidas' epitaph is a genuine literary poem. It might as well have been designed for a tombstone and later been included

⁷⁰ The Muses as patron goddesses of fine arts were often represented in schoolrooms by statues or paintings; cf. Herondas 3.96–7.

in an epigram book.⁷¹ In this case, the author of the epitaph in Asian Hadrianoi probably learned about his model from a literary collection,⁷² which often functioned as a promulgator of epigrammatic themes, but the poem he copied was nevertheless not a genuinely literary epigram. The situation is further complicated by the fact that Leonidas' poem was imitated by at least two epigrammatists and probably more.⁷³ Therefore, while the intertextual references make it very likely that the anonymous poet of Asia Minor knew Leonidas' epigram,⁷⁴ his inspiration by an imitation unknown to us cannot be excluded.

External evidence is even more important in an example from the group of bucolic epigrams. In *IG* IV.53 (= Kaibel 271), an inscription from Aigina of uncertain date, an anonymous speaker, whom Boyancé identified as Pan, declares that he lost interest in playing the flute in the forests and grottoes and even in his formerly beloved Echo. Instead, he now laments righteous Ampelius "there where the Muses take delight in the plane trees and brooks." The inscription most probably accompanied a statue of Pan erected in a temenos in honor of (the otherwise unknown) Ampelius and dedicated to the Muses. As Rossi (2001: 58–9) points out, the epigram is probably modeled on Meleager 126 GP (= *AP* 7.535). In both poems, the speaker Pan laments the loss of all joy in life; and in both cases the rejection of his former pleasures is introduced by an anaphora of οὐκέτι and the lament is prompted by the death of a specific person (Ampelius and Daphnis). Although the parallels seem close enough to establish a connection between the two poems, the decision which of the two is to be regarded as the model depends not so much on internal evidence as on the external dating of the inscription and on a general assessment of how frequent the motif of mourning Pan leaving the mountains might have been.

⁷¹ Gow-Page (1965: 2.50) consider this possibility without making a decision. It is a well known fact that at least some Hellenistic epigrammatists composed both literary and inscribed poems; cf. the testimonies on Posidippus.

⁷² The other possibility is that the poet gained knowledge of Leonidas' poem by actually reading it on a tombstone, but since little is known about Leonidas' wanderings, cf. Gow-Page (1965: 2.307), and nothing of the whereabouts of the anonymous poet from Hadrianoi, this too remains speculation.

⁷³ Antipater of Sidon 21 GP (= *AP* 7.164) and *AP* 7.165; Amyntas (P.Ox. 662); cf. also *GVI* 1858 for an inscribed imitation of the latter and Gow-Page (1965: 2.50) and *SGO* 08/08/10 with Merkelbach and Stauber (1998–2004: 2.121) for a brief discussion of the topic.

⁷⁴ This seems plausible since other known imitations do not exhibit literal parallels to the inscribed epigram.

While these examples show the imitation of models within a specific genre of epigram (funerary and epideictic), there is also evidence for a more liberal use of motifs borrowed from literary sources. On a boundary stone from Kanytelis, dated to the first to third century A.D., we read the following dialogue (*SGO* 19/10/01):⁷⁵

θηρῶν κράτιστε καὶ ἰθεῶν μύστα, λέων, ἰ
 τίνος φυλάσσεις χώρον ἰ ἐς γένος μακρόν; ἰ
 τίς σῆς ὑπάρχει θνητὸς ὦν ἰ τειμῆς, φράσον. ἰ
 ἀνδρῶν ἄριστος καὶ πάτρας ἰ προὔχων ἀνὴρ ἰ
 ἀρετῆς δὲ πάσης στέμμασιν ἰ κοσμούμενος ἰ
 Σανδαῖος, ὃς γῆς δεσπότης ἰ ταύτης κυρεῖ. ἰ

Strongest of beasts and initiate to the gods, lion,
 whose land do you guard for long generations?
 Say, which mortal receives this honor from you?
 The best of men and he who is prominent in his hometown,
 adorned with wreaths of every honor,
 Sandaios, who rules as master over this land.

The epigram may remind the reader of Antipater of Sidon 31 GP (= *AP* 7.426):

Εἰπέ, λέων, φθιμένοιο τίνος τάφον ἀμφιβέβηκας;
 βουφάγε, τίς τᾶς σᾶς ἄξιος ἦν ἀρετᾶς;
 Υἱὸς Θευδώροιο Τελευτίας⁷⁶ ὃς μέγα πάντων
 φέρτατος ἦν θηρῶν ὅσσον ἐγὼ κέκριμαι.
 οὐχὶ μάταν ἔστακα, φέρω δέ τι σύμβολον ἀλκᾶς
 ἀνέρος· ἦν γὰρ δὴ δυσμενέεσσι λέων.

Tell, lion, the grave of which dead man do you protect?
 Devourer of bulls, who was worthy of your strength?
 The son of Theudoros, Teleutias, who was by far
 the strongest of all, just as I am considered the strongest of beasts.
 And not in vain do I stand here, for I bear some sign of this man's
 strength:
 For he truly was a lion to hostile men.

Although the two poems differ in meter and show no literal parallels, their way of thinking runs along identical lines: after a respectful address to the lion, the anonymous passerby asks about the identity of the person whose tomb or possessions the lion guards. In both cases,

⁷⁵ Merkelbach and Stauber (1998–2004: 4.205)

⁷⁶ Τελευτία Korsch, accepted by Gow-Page; Τελευτία P, Τελευτίας Reiske.

the service of so noble an animal is perceived as an honor for a mortal and is accordingly justified by the lion who claims that he serves the best or strongest of men. In neither poem does the line of argumentation show a flaw comparable to that of Cladus' funerary epigram. We must, therefore, look for different criteria to establish their mutual relationship.

A more promising approach is to consider the features that enable the transition between the epigrammatic genres. The crossover is facilitated by several shared characteristics of tomb and border stones: both are set up on an occasion in which the owner of the site is perceived as potentially helpless (either because deceased and therefore unable to defend himself from possible desecration, or because, although still alive, unable to guard the borders of his land day and night), while aiming at a maximum of security for his possession, possibly exceeding his own lifetime. In both cases the owner of the site may wish to seek refuge with some superhuman power, as symbolized by the lion.

Only on a tombstone, however, is the idea of longlasting protection and defense against violators naturally connected to the idea of mortality.⁷⁷ In fact, many boundary stones, though warning neighbors against violation of the border, seem to have functioned perfectly well without any hint of the landowner's mortality. The Kanytelis inscription, however, draws heavily on the connection of the lion to the immortals (θεῶν μύστα, λέων),⁷⁸ as opposed to the mortal landowner whose estate he protects (ἐς γένος μακρόν; θνητὸς ὄν). It is therefore likely that the line of tradition runs from the more natural context (the tombstone) to the more artificial (a border stone), an assumption that is confirmed by external dating.⁷⁹

Apart from these direct parallels, Hellenistic epigrams may also exercise a more subtle influence on inscribed epigrams in an indirect way that has so far attracted little attention. It is widely known, for example, that

⁷⁷ Cf. in our example the past tense φέρτατος ἦν for the deceased and the perfect φέρτατος [...] θηρῶν ὅσσον ἐγὼ κέκριμαι for the lion, indicating his unbroken might.

⁷⁸ Merkelbach and Stauber (1998–2004: 4.205) suggest that the expression “initiate to the gods” points to some local tradition that regarded lions as servants of Rhea/Cybele.

⁷⁹ Merkelbach and Stauber ad loc. accept the dating by Dagron and Feissel (1987: 50–1, n. 20).

Latin elegists and epigrammatists get some of their inspiration from poems of the *GA*, which is obvious in Propertius and Martial,⁸⁰ but also true for Catullus, Ovid and Tibullus. All of these serve in turn as models for Latin inscriptions,⁸¹ so that they may function as mediators between Greek literary and Latin inscribed epigrams. Examples include Ovid *am.* 1.13 which is inspired by Meleager 27 and 28 GP (= *AP* 5.172 and 173)⁸² and alluded to in several Latin inscriptions⁸³ and Ovid *am.* 2.6 (a funeral epitaph for Corinna's pet parrot), which closely follows Hellenistic tradition although no single source can be identified, and is quoted in at least four Latin inscriptions.⁸⁴

However, most of the imitations so far discovered present rather faint connections to Hellenistic epigrams, although we cannot rule out the possibility of new discoveries of the material remains of elegy and epigram which may shed light on the intricate relationship between these two genera.

The influence of inscriptions on literary epigrams is very different from that of literary poems on inscriptions. While traces of inscriptional formulas can be discerned in literary epigrams even without identifying a specific model, we face almost insuperable difficulties when trying to identify general literary influences in inscriptions not linked to a specific source. In most cases, we are limited to establishing a link between two specific poems.

As a result, the insights that we might gain from such studies differ considerably. Identifying traces of inscribed epigrams in Hellenistic literary poems may tell us a great deal about Hellenistic narrative techniques and poetic skills and preferences, but may be of relatively little value for concretely identifying the transmission of certain motifs.

⁸⁰ The relationship between Propertius and the Greek epigram is studied by Schulz-Vanheyden (1970).

⁸¹ A useful discussion of the issue (including indices and statistics) can be found in Lissberger (1934).

⁸² Cf. Paduano (1989) ad loc.

⁸³ *am.* 1.13.31: *complexa tenere* at the end of the verse = Buecheler 1335.9; *am.* 1.13.33: *invida, quo properas* ~ Buecheler 1298.1: *invidē, quid gaudes?* (in both cases at the beginning of the verse); *am.* 1.13.39: *complexa teneres* = Buecheler 950.1; *am.* 1.13.45: *ne te tam saepe videret* = Martial 8.25 ~ Buecheler 352.2: *non te tam saepe videbo*, in both cases at the end of the verse.

⁸⁴ *Ov. am.* 2.6.13 = Buecheler 1972.2; *Ov. am.* 2.16.25 = Buecheler 11.65.5; *Ov. am.* 2.6.51 = Buecheler 939.1; *Ov. am.* 2.6.59 ~ Buecheler 1917.4.

On the other hand, if the influence of literary epigrams on a given inscription can be proved, this might improve our understanding of the circulation of Hellenistic poetry or the mobility of travelers in the Hellenistic world. These connections will in most cases be limited to relatively few, and local examples, which will have to be reevaluated on a regular basis against new archeological discoveries. Only when we can be sure of having a reliable overview of the extant inscribed and literary epigrams may we hope for a thorough evaluation of what remains in the meantime the dark side of the moon.

FROM ARCHAIC ELEGY TO HELLENISTIC SYMPOTIC EPIGRAM?

Ewen Bowie

A prominent feature of archaic and classical Greek *symposia*¹ was the singing of songs in elegiac meter, songs that often mentioned and sometimes debated the conventions of their sympotic location of performance and that occasionally declared, bewailed or reflected upon sexual desire, ἔρως. In the poems of the earliest generation of Hellenistic epigrammatists, Asclepiades, Callimachus, Hedylus and Posidippus, erotic and, rather less, sympotic themes are also prominent. Are the poems of the third-century poets lineal and (as it were) Darwinian descendants of elegy as sung between the seventh and the fifth centuries (as, for example, Reitzenstein argued),² or are they the result of a conscious decision to create a new genre? Whatever answer is given, it can claim only probability, not certainty, since much is still debated about the performance and writing of epigram in the third century B.C., and even more remains obscure concerning the performance, writing down and collection of archaic and classical elegy, of which most survives only in fragments and in only a few cases can we be sure we have a complete poem.³

Prima facie, however, the respects in which archaic and classical elegy differed from third-century epigram are numerous. For a start, before even the characteristics of early elegy are assessed, we must remember that elegiac poetry formed only a part, and perhaps in many cases a small part, of oral performances at *symposia* (to say nothing of other forms of musical, dancing and pantomimic diversion). Within the category of oral exchanges many will simply have been in (for the want

¹ For the Greek symposium see Murray (1983a), (1983b) and (1990); Vetta (1983).

² Reitzenstein (1893). A similar conclusion is argued for by Cameron (1995) esp. chap. 3, "The symposium."

³ The surviving texts of early Greek elegy are most conveniently found in Gerber (1999a). For the place of elegy in the symposium cf. West (1974), Bowie (1986) and (1990b).

of a better term) prose: story-telling, contributions to conversation and—perhaps rarely—more formal speeches.⁴ A symposiast who moved from prose to poetry or song had a number of choices, at least in Ionia or in cities whose sympotic culture had adopted Ionian fashions in song. Certainly in Paros, Thasos and Amorgos of the seventh century or in Ephesus and Samos of the sixth an Archilochus or Semonides, a Hipponax or an Anacreon could sing elegies or perform *iamboi* (perhaps in some sort of recitative), poems that might be in consecutive lines of iambic trimeters or trochaic tetrameters or might (in *Epodes*) combine these with other iambic or dactylic metrical units.⁵ It is clear that iambic trimeters or trochaic tetrameters were also available to sympotic poets in Athens of the early sixth century (Solon) and of the fifth century (Euenus, Hermippus): whether *Epodes* were still composed in the fifth century, or indeed ever, outside Paros, Thasos, Ephesus and Samos, is quite uncertain (though Diogenes Laertius 1.61 claims *Epodes* for Solon). As mention of Anacreon indicates, there was also a strong tradition of singing to the accompaniment of a stringed instrument: that may have been the only mode of singing in Aeolic *symposia*, and it certainly flourished alongside performance of elegies and *iamboi* in many cities (e.g., Sparta, Athens, Thebes, Rhegion, Samos). A song-type prominent in Attic *symposia* but not unique to them was the *skolion*, a song in units of two or four-lines, in meters most of which are Aeolic, to the first verse of which others could be offered in reply or thematic variation.⁶

This map (here much simplified) of the complex sympotic culture of oral performance in the archaic and classical periods is likely to have been known (in greater detail and with many more points of certainty) to all the third-century epigrammatists, as it must surely have been known to Callimachus.⁷ In choosing to write erotic and sympotic epigram exclusively (or almost exclusively) in elegiac couplets these poets

⁴ Bowie (1994).

⁵ It may be relevant for assessment of Hellenistic epigrams in mixed meters that archaic inscribed epigrams also combined different metrical units, cf. Friedländer and Hoffleit (1948) nos. 155–79 and Page (1976).

⁶ The surviving pieces of Greek lyric poetry, including Attic *skolia*, are most conveniently found in Campbell (1982–93).

⁷ For Callimachus, cf. especially fr. 178 Pf. For Hellenistic awareness of *skolia* cf. the *skolia* attributed to the Seven Sages by Diogenes Laertius 1.34, 61, 71, 78, 85 and 91 (= *SH* 521–6). For the problem of the continuity of sympotic culture cf. Murray (1996: esp. 23).

seem likely to have been well aware that they were selecting only one of the poetic media exploited in archaic and classical *symposia*.

Some features of the distribution of subject between these poetic media will also have been familiar. First, the “sympotic.” In our extant, lamentably fragmentary remains references to and exploitation of a sympotic context are not infrequent in elegy: in some elegiac songs it constitutes the main subject (Xenophanes fr. 1 W, Euenus fr. 8a W (= *Theognidea* 467–96), Critias fr. 6 W, perhaps Dionysius Chalcus fr. 3 W), in many more the sympotic setting is drawn in to lead into another topic (e.g., *Theognidea* 879–84) or to reinforce a song’s objective, e.g. praise (Dionysius Chalcus frs. 1 and 4 W), the promise of poetic immortality (*Theognis* 237–54) or consolation (Archilochus fr. 13 W). Exploitation of a sympotic context is relatively rare in *iambus* (one persuasive case is Ananius fr. 5 W),⁸ though addresses to friends who are also known from elegiac poems seem frequent enough to secure for *iambus* a sympotic context of performance. In favoring a type of elegiac poem in which the sympotic was prominent, therefore, the third-century poets can certainly be seen to be taking up a feature that marked out archaic elegy as different from archaic *iambus*. At the same time they must have been aware that exploitation of a sympotic context was also prominent in the melic poems of Alcaeus and Anacreon, so that its evocation in Hellenistic epigrams did not give these a uniquely elegiac color. Moreover, given the interest of Hellenistic poets in recasting genres in unexpected meters (e.g., the composition of the epinician for the chariot victory of Berenice in elegiac meter), we should not assume that a sympotic context in a Hellenistic poem in elegiacs would be expected uncomplicatedly to evoke archaic sympotic elegy.⁹

The centrality in much Hellenistic epigram of sexual desire, ἔρως, is a different matter. Desire was a major topic in the poetry of archaic and classical *symposia*, which is just what might be expected given the erotic activity so well attested for *symposia* by vase painting,¹⁰ but the genre in which it is least prominent is elegy. Different sorts of erotic adventures are narrated in Archilochus’ *iamboi* (e.g., the trimeter fragments 23 and 48 W, and presumably some of the poems from which

⁸ Note too the case made for sympotic performance of Semonides fr. 7 W by Osborne (2001).

⁹ I am grateful to Peter Bing for this point.

¹⁰ See especially Lissarrague (1990).

fr. 31–47 W come) including narrative in at least one *epode* (fr. 196 and 196A W); perhaps in some trimeters of Semonides (fr. 16–8 W);¹¹ and in Hipponax's choliambic *iambi* (e.g. fr. 11–25 W, 84 W, possibly 92 W). Expressions of sexual desire, comment on its power, and recollection of its consequences are also recurrent in archaic melic poetry, above all in fragments of Sappho, Ibycus and Anacreon, but occasionally in Alcaeus and already in Alcman.

In elegy, by contrast, there seems to have been almost no place for narrative of sexual adventures, and neither declarations of ἔρως nor comments on its effects are widespread (an exception is constituted by Theognis "Book Two," to be discussed below). Of course we could be the victims of selective transmission, and our elegiac corpus of some archaic poets, e.g. Tyrtaeus and Callinus, may have privileged martial exhortatory elegy to the point of excluding other material.¹² The fragments of Solon may offer a more representative sample of the place given to ἔρως in archaic elegy: one couplet cited in Plutarch's *On desire* (Ἐρωτικός) expresses readiness for sex, drink and song (fr. 26 W); another also cited there (fr. 25 W) refers to lust for thighs and mouth in words branded as most lascivious by Apuleius (*Apology* 9); a third lists boys (παῖδες) as elements in the good life (fr. 23 W); and in a fourth (fr. 22a W), Solon refers to his nephew as "blond-haired Critias," a phrase that may arouse suspicion of his intent. Against this we must set the current state of knowledge of the elegies of Archilochus and Mimnermus. So far there is nothing at all involving ἔρως in the elegiac fragments of Archilochus, now (with the new *Telephus* narrative) exceeding one hundred lines in all.¹³ Mimnermus had a reputation as a love poet as early as Hermesianax fr. 7.35–8, but the representation there of Mimnermus "burning" for Nanno and having some relationship with a male figure Examyas has so far received no direct support from the fragments, admittedly depressingly sparse: perhaps there was indeed much more, and eight lines opening with a description of the singer's extreme physical reactions to the sight of youthful beauty and then moving to his recurrent focus on the horrors of old age (fr. 5 W)

¹¹ Cf. Bowie (2001).

¹² It is possible, however, that *Theognidea* 879–84, opening with an invitation to drink wine grown beneath the peaks of the Taygetus, owes its survival into the *Theognidea* to initial transmission in a collection ascribed to Tyrtaeus.

¹³ In fr. 1 W the epithet ἐρατόν is given to the Μουσέων δῶρον. We cannot tell whether the lines following this couplet did or did not touch on sexual desire.

could well have played a part in a poem of declaration and would-be-seduction.¹⁴

Our perceptions changed somewhat in 1992 with the publication of papyrus fragments of two elegiac poems of Simonides (21 and 22 W²). In the first of these (21 W²) the singer seems to open a poem by professing weakness in the face of sexual temptation, temptation that bids fair to overwhelm his respect for Justice (Δίκ[ην] line 2) and sense of decency ([αἰδώς] line 9). In the second (22 W²) he fantasises about a journey to an idyllic island where he could gaze on blond Echecratidas and have fun with him reclining among flowers:¹⁵

κα[ὶ κεν] Ἐχεκ[ρατί]δην ξανθότ[ρι]χα
 ὀφ[θαλμοῖσιν ἰδ]ὼν χεῖρα λάβοιμ[ι]
 ὄφρα νέο[ν] χ[αρίεντ]ος ἀπὸ χροὸς ἄνθο[ς]
 λείβοι δ' ἐκ βλ[εφάρ]ων ἱμερόεντα [πόθον]

and Echecratidas with his blond hair would be []
 seen by these [old?] eyes of mine, and I could [again?] take his
 hand

so that he might [diffuse?] the young bloom from his graceful skin
 and pour desire-arousing longing from his lids.

(Simonides 22.9–12 W²)

The poem was at least 21 lines long, but may never have moved from fantasy to narrative; and whether fr. 21 W² did so can only be guessed. But even if they did not add secure sexual narratives to our *corpus* of early elegy, these two papyrus fragments showed that in Simonidean elegy, at least, sexual desire was given a significant role.

The sparsity of ἐρωτικά found in the other elegists also marks the so-called first book of the *Theognidea*, i.e., the 1200 lines that are found in all fifty or so manuscripts of “Theognis” (for the 159 lines found only in a Paris manuscript and usually referred to as “Theognis Book Two” see below).¹⁶ Of the four lines 263–6 (which may well be two couplets that do not belong together, or at any rate are not sequential) 265–6 seem to come as near as any elegiac lines to narrating an erotic adventure:

¹⁴ For the probability of a sympotic context for Mimermus fr. 5 W, cf. Slings (2000).

¹⁵ For discussion of this and the other fragments first published in 1992 see Boedeker and Sider (2001); and on this fragment esp. Mace (2001: 185–207).

¹⁶ For hypotheses about the growth of the *Theognidea* see West (1974: 40–61), Bowie (1997).

ἔνθα μέσῃν περὶ παῖδα λαβὼν ἀγκῶν' ἐφίλησα
 δειρήν, ἣ δὲ τέρεν φθέγγετ' ἀπὸ στόματος.

where putting my arm about the girl's waist I kissed
 her neck, and she uttered a sweet sound with her mouth.

(*Theognidea* 265–6)

But without secure knowledge of adjacent lines it is impossible to know what sort of poem the couplet came from. The couplet just before, 261–2, sounds like the complaint of a disappointed lover:

οὐ μοι πίνεται οἶνος, ἐπεὶ παρὰ παιδὶ τερείνῃ
 ἄλλος ἀνὴρ καλ' ἔχει πολλὸν ἐμοῦ κακίων.

I am not drinking wine, because in the company of my sweet girl
 another man is having a good time, one much inferior to me.

(*Theognidea* 261–2)

The claim to be off wine sounds like an opening (cf. Archilochus 196 W²) but we do not know how the self-diagnosis proceeded (that 265–6 was part of this poem is of course possible).

A third fragment in the same block of the *Theognidea*, 257–60, has a singer compare herself (himself?) to a pretty mare with an ugly or bad rider whom she would like to throw off. Again this is erotic, but playful rather than soulful. From whatever source they come, the fragments at *Theognidea* 257–266 seem to attest the availability of some erotic elegy when “Book One” was assembled, perhaps in the fourth century B.C.

One or two other fragments in Book One support this impression, though none of them involves Theognis' addressee Cyrnus (or rather, since he exists only in the vocative, “Cyrne”). One is a poem of six lines:

νεβρὸν ὑπὲξ ἐλάφοιο λέων ὥς ἀλκὶ πεποιθώς
 ποσσὶ καταμάρψας αἵματος οὐκ ἔπιον·
 τειχέων δ' ὑψηλῶν ἐπιβάς πόλιν οὐκ ἀλάπαξα
 ζευξάμενος δ' ἵππους ἄρματος οὐκ ἐπέβην·
 πρήξας οὐκ ἔπρηξα, καὶ οὐκ ἐτέλεσσα τελέσσας,
 δρῆσας δ' οὐκ ἔδρησ', ἦνυσσα δ' οὐκ ἀνύσας.

Though like a lion, trusting in his might, I have snatched a fawn
 from beneath the doe with my paws, I did not drink its blood;
 Though I mounted its high walls, I did not sack the city,
 and though I yoked the horses, I did not mount the chariot;
 I achieved and did not achieve, I finished and did not finish,

I did the deed, and did not, I accomplished but did not accomplish.

(*Theognidea* 949–54)

The images that the singer uses to figure ἔρως are all plausibly taken to refer to male sexual conquest, but they are presented in a way that makes the poem's status as a riddle more significant than that as a boast of either conquest or abstention.

Another is the much longer 993–1002, 10 lines (if all belong together):

εἰ θεΐης, Ἀκάδημε, ἐφίμερον ὕμνον ἀεΐδειν,
 ἄθλον δ' ἐν μέσσω παῖς καλὸν ἄνθος ἔχων
 σοὶ τ' εἶη καὶ ἐμοὶ σοφίης πέρι δηρὸν ἀντοῖν,
 γνοίης χ' ὅσσον ὄνων κρέσσονες ἡμίονοι.
 τῆμος δ' ἡέλιος μὲν ἐν αἰθέρι μώνυχας ἵππους
 ἄρτι παραγγέλλοι μέσσαντον ἡμᾶρ ἔχων,
 δέϊπνον δὲ λήγοιμεν, ὅπου τινὰ θυμὸς ἀνώγοι,
 παντοίων ἀγαθῶν γαστρὶ χαριζόμενοι,
 χέρνιβα δ' αἶψα θύραζε φέροι, στεφανώματα δ' εἴσω
 εὐειδῆς ῥαδινᾷς χερσὶ Λάκαινα κόρη.

If you were to propose, Academus, that we sing a lovely hymn,
 and the prize before us was a boy in the fair bloom of youth,
 a prize for you and me when we had striven in skill—
 then you would learn how much better mules are than asses.
 And at that point the sun in the high heaven would just be urging on
 his single-hooved horses, reaching midday,
 and we would cease from our banquet, indulging our belly,
 however our spirit demanded, with all sorts of good things,
 and suddenly the water-basin would be carried out, and garlands in,
 by a beautiful Laconian girl with her slender arms.

(*Theognidea* 993–1002)

The main theme of the poem is a banquet followed by a mini-symposium: during both there will be competitive song. An erotic frisson is added by the poet's mention of the prize for the winner—a sexually attractive boy—and of a pretty serving girl (a consolation prize for the loser?). But whatever happens in the chronotope of the poem (singing, eating and perhaps drinking) or outside it (sex?) all this, like Simonides 22 W², is poetic fantasy, not narrative of what has (or is claimed to have) happened.

Lines 949–50 reappear in the mysterious “Book Two,” whose bearing on the prominence of ἐρωτικά in early elegy must now be briefly assessed. “Book Two” of Theognis is apparently what the scribe of the early tenth-century Paris manuscript,¹⁷ which alone preserves its 159

¹⁷ Par. suppl. gr. 388 folios 46r–75v.

lines, initially thought he was transcribing; and his (or his exemplar's) decision to copy it immediately after the 1220 or so lines of what he plausibly took to be a collection of Theognidean elegy chimes with that view. If it was he, however, who betrayed second thoughts by erasing the author's name (presumably Θεόγνιδος given ἐλεγείων β'), he showed some appreciation of the extent to which these lines differed from what preceded them. There are, admittedly, elements of similarity: like 949–50, three other fragments appear both in Book One and in "Book Two"; "Book Two," like Book One, has a gnomic quatrain (1353–6) addressed to Cyrnus that has some chance of being by the Megarian poet Theognis; it has a version of a couplet of Solon (fr. 23 W) close to that quoted by Plato in the *Lysis*; it has a poem probably by Euenus of Paros, perhaps complete (1341–50)—just as Book One has two quite long, and even more probably complete, pieces of Euenus (467–96 and 667–82);¹⁸ and some of its themes touch upon friendship and trust, very prominent in Book One. Against these elements of similarity is the striking difference that all of "Book Two" can be read as bearing upon desire for boys, παῖδες; many of its poems are addressed to an unnamed boy, παῖς; and the collection (if collection it is) is preceded by a quatrain apostrophising Eros and cataloguing some of its destructive effects.

σχέτλι' Ἔρως, Μανίαι σ' ἐτιθνήσαντο λαβοῦσαι·
 ἐκ σέθεν ὤλετο μὲν Ἴλίου ἀκρόπολις,
 ὤλετο δ' Αἰγείδης Θησεὺς μέγας, ὤλετο δ' Αἴας
 ἐσθλὸς Οἰλιάδης ἥσιν ἀτασθαλίαις.

Uncompromising Desire, it was the Madnesses who took you and fostered you!

Because of you was the acropolis of Ilion destroyed,
 mighty Theseus, son of Aegeus, was destroyed, and destroyed too was
 Ajax

the noble son of Oileus through his own acts of outrage.¹⁹

(*Theognidea* 1231–4)

This is not the place to pursue and refute the curious but widely held theory that the lines of "Book Two" were transmitted interspersed with those of Book One until separated off by a prudish or prurient

¹⁸ See below.

¹⁹ For the problem of the relation between these lines and Apollonius Rhodius 4.445–9 see Vetta (1980: 38).

Byzantine copier.²⁰ From whatever source it ultimately and proximately stemmed, the collection in “Book Two” has greater difference from than similarity to that which is constituted by Book One. Most of its lines are undatable, but the presence (as mentioned) of a couplet by Solon and a sequence by Euenus suggests that at least some of the other pieces may come from the span 590–440 B.C. If that is so, then the total surviving corpus of early elegy (i.e., elegy composed before the 430s) had a much higher proportion of homo-erotic poetry than is indicated either by the fragments of the major elegists quoted by later Greek authors or preserved on papyrus or by the texture of the elegiac song-book we know as Theognis Book One.

With a view to assessing the impact of early elegy as a whole on the third-century epigrammatists we need, then, to distinguish three possible reconstructions of the growth of Book One and “Book Two” of the *Theognidea*:

- (a) The hypothesis of a ninth-century A.D. expurgation of homoerotic poems from an elegiac collection in which they were hitherto interspersed entails the possibility (though not, of course, the certainty) that by the fourth or even the late fifth century B.C. (dates that some scholars have favored for the assembly of at least part of what we now have as *Theognidea* Book One) readers of elegiac would be familiar not just with *corpora* of some individual poets in which (even in the case of Mimnermus) few ἐρωτικά were to be found, but also with a selection of the work of these and other elegists in which could be found a small but significant proportion of ἐρωτικά, all or mostly homoerotic, many opening with an address to an unnamed boy, πᾶϊ or ὦ πᾶϊ.
- (b) It is possible that the collection in “Book Two” was made in the late Hellenistic or imperial period (e.g., in the reign of Hadrian, like the book of homoerotic epigrams composed by Strato of Sardis): this would have only slightly different implications. If all or most of its elegiac pieces antedate the 430s, then in the third century B.C. they must have been available somewhere—not, on this hypothesis, scattered among what later became Book One, nor in most cases (as far as can be ascertained) in the individual *corpora* of the big names of archaic and classical elegy, but perhaps in a selection or a number of selections from less well-known poets.
- (c) The third possibility (to which the oddity of the immediately previously suggested situation may seem to point) is that a collection identical with or very like “Book Two” goes all the way back to the classical

²⁰ Accepted, for example, by West (1974: 43–5), Vetta (1980: xii–xiii).

period—no earlier, however, than Euenus of Paros, apparently the poet of 1341–50. There is no particular oddity in a collection made in the fifth century having failed to achieve citation throughout antiquity (as it seems “Book Two” did): the vast majority of quotations of Book One are of morally uplifting passages. It does not matter for this chapter precisely when, or precisely by whom, such a classical collection might have been made, though it is worth remembering that the dream-interpreter of the second century A.D., Artemidorus (*Onir.* 1.4) knew a collection of ἐρωτικά ascribed to none other than Euenus, a writer also known to Epictetus (at least as presented by Arrian) as lubricious and mentioned in the same breath as the author of Milesian tales, Aristides (*Diss.* 4.9.6). I shall explore elsewhere the hypothesis that Euenus was in fact the compiler of an ancestor of “Book Two.”

On this third hypothesis the third-century epigrammatists will have known at least one category of elegiac poetry in which ἐρωτικά were present but not prominent (*corpora* of individual elegists; an earlier version of *Theognidea* Book One) but also a small and perhaps relatively coherent collection of homoerotic poetry.

It should now be clear how great an obstacle to understanding the development of erotic epigram is constituted by our uncertainty about the early history of the *Theognidea*. Unfortunately this uncertainty concerning precedents for the third-century epigrammatists’ choice of sympotic and erotic material is matched by comparable ignorance about the typical length of an archaic or classical elegy (if there was a typical length) or about the date and manner in which elegies were first arranged in books and composed with an eye on such arrangement.

First, the matter of length. Here too we have far less to go on than is needed for a secure judgement. Of early and classical elegy as a whole a significant number of poems composed for sympotic performance seems to have exceeded 40 lines. Tyrtaeus fr. 12 W had at least 44; Solon fr. 13 W, arguably a complete poem, has 76 lines; and his largely lost poem later entitled *Salamis* had 100 lines, though it might be argued that it was not intended, or intended primarily, for sympotic performance. The new *Telephus* fragment of Archilochus, in which a first person plural verb points to a sympotic performance, runs to 45 lines and must come from a poem much longer. The sequences at *Theognidea* 373–400 and 903–30 reach 28 lines, the former with gaps and the latter without an opening or closure. Shorter complete poems may be represented by Theognis 39–52 (14 lines) 183–92 (10 lines).

None of these poems either handles ἔρωξ or makes direct reference

to a sympotic context, and in the ones that do handle ἔρωϝ the upper limit on length so far attested is perceptibly lower. To take poems with references to sympotic contexts first, Archilochus fr. 13 W seems complete at 10 lines, though another poem lamenting loss in a shipwreck (fr. 8–12 W) which, like 13 W, made explicit reference to sympotic relaxation must (to judge from papyrus fragments) have exceeded 30 lines. Theognis' promise to Cyrnus of poetic immortality (237–54) is transmitted as 28 lines.²¹ Of the two Euenus poems in Book One of the *Theognidea*, that which has no sympotic allusions (667–82) may be complete at 16 lines, that focused entirely on sympotic behavior (467–96) may be complete at 30 lines: Xenophanes' prescription for a symposium (fr. B 1, quoted by a diner in Athenaeus to illustrate the similarity of the symposium of his *Deipnosophistae*) has 24 lines. A poem of welcome to a returning friend (*Theognidea* 511–22), perhaps implicitly sympotic, is almost certainly complete at 12 lines (cf. Archilochus' *iambus* on the same theme, fr. 24 W, a complete trimeter poem of 18 lines). Below 12 lines it is hard to go with any confidence, though the 10 lines of *Theognidea* 993–1002, fantasizing about a contest at a banquet with a boy in his prime as the prize, might be complete.

Likewise with elegies whose chief subject is ἔρωϝ. The fantasy of Simonides fr. 22 W² certainly exceeded 21 lines, but perhaps not by much. The longest sequence in Book Two, *Theognidea* 1283–96, might be complete at 12 lines, as may Euenus' declaration of desire at 1341–50, 10 lines. Two are at least 8 lines (1311–18, 1327–34) and need not have been longer.

We might be entitled to conclude that elegies with sympotic subjects were frequently between 10 and 30 lines, and that those with erotic subjects might have reached, but not often, the low 20s. That conclusion is precarious, but even more precarious is any attempt to infer how short some poems might have been. Many quatrains or couplets in archaic elegy have been pronounced complete poems on totally inadequate grounds. Of quatrains in "Book Two" whose opening seems secure (1249–52, 1259–62, 1263–6, 1271–4, 1295–8), any one could in principle be complete. Three of the four hymnic poems that open the *Theognidea* (1–4, 11–4, 15–8) are 4-liners, one (95–100) is a 6-liner. All look complete. Accordingly, that some erotic elegiac poems were

²¹ Faraone (forthcoming).

complete at four lines, or were being transmitted in the third century B.C. in a manner in which they seemed to be complete at four lines, is a plausible assumption.²²

Furthermore, on the evidence available, 6-liners were not common: no piece in *Theognidea* Book One or “Book Two” is confidently marked by West as a complete poem at 6 lines. Some of course may indeed be complete; whereas in “Book Two” there is no plausible candidate, in Book One several might be considered: 323–8, 447–52, 503–8 (sympotic), 549–54, 789–94 (sympotic), 805–10, 879–84, 1017–22 (Mimnermus, erotic), 1123–8 (?Archilochus),²³ 1196–1202, and 1211–6.

When we compare the poetry so far known of Asclepiades, Hedylus, Posidippus and Callimachus the data are more secure, though again we must allow for some selection in what is available to us.²⁴ I set out below a table distributing these poets’ elegiac epigrams²⁵ according to length, from 2-liners to a 16-liner of Callimachus (the longest epigram by any of these poets).²⁶ I have attempted to register erotic and sympotic epigrams separately, but noted some cases where an epigram has features of both. The lines in which “all” are listed include (as well as sympotic and erotic) epitaphic, dedicatory and reflective poems. Most of the eleven Callimachean couplets are epitaphic or dedicatory.

²² As Peter Bing has pointed out to me, it seems likely that collections of early elegiac poetry known to the Hellenistic poets also contained two-line poems that looked as if they might be complete (whatever their original length) and this may have encouraged these poets to fuse elegy and epigram. And indeed the Hellenistic ancestor of the *Theognidea* contained at least one two-liner, the *Epigramma Deliacum*, 255–6, which was also inscribed on the propylaion of the temple of Leto on Delos (Arist. *Eth. Eud.* A 1 p.1214a5, cf. *Eth. Nic.* 1.8.14 p.1099a27). These features linking early elegy and epigram in general, however, seem not to have resulted in a choice of the two-liner for sympotic or erotic epigrams in particular, as emerges from the table below—of 13 two-liners by the four poets only one, Asclepiades 21 GP (= AP 12.75) is erotic, none is sympotic.

²³ For possible Archilochean authorship see Bowie (forthcoming).

²⁴ Cf. Argentieri in this volume.

²⁵ I.e., the non-elegiac epigrams of Callimachus have not been taken into account.

²⁶ If we consider the “Seal” of Posidippus (*SH* 705), which exceeded 25 lines, to be elegy not epigram.

	2 lines	4 lines	6 lines	8 lines	10 lines	12 lines	14 lines	16 lines
All four poets	13	111	71	17	7	3	3	1
Asclepiades all poems	1	26	6	1		1		
Asclepiades sympotic			1			1		
Asclepiades erotic	1	20	5	1		[~ erotic]		
		[1~ sympotic, 1~sepulchral]	[1~ sympotic]	[~ sympotic]				
Callimachus all poems	11	27	17		1	1		1
Callimachus sympotic								
Callimachus erotic		4	8		1			
		[1 ²⁷ ~sympotic]	[2 ²⁸ ~ sympotic]					
Hedylus all poems		1	6		2			
Hedylus sympotic		1	2		2			
			(?+1)		[1~ dedicatory]			
Hedylus erotic			4					
			[3 ~ sympotic]					
Posidippus all poems	1	57	42	16	4	1	3	
				[2~ sympotic]	[2~ dedicatory]			
Posidippus sympotic		1	1	1				
Posidippus erotic		9	2	1				
Posidippus Milan papyrus		45	38	11	2		3	

²⁷ 5 GP (= *AP* 12.51). Mention of Ganymede in 6 GP (= *AP* 12.230) does not seem to me enough to show that the poem constructs a sympotic context.

²⁸ 8 and 13 GP (= *AP* 12.118 and 134).

Prima facie the 4-liner is the form by far the most favored by all but Hedylus, whose scanty oeuvre, chiefly preserved by Athenaeus, shows a preference for 6-liners.²⁹ His two sympotic 10-liners (out of nine complete poems) give him a very different profile from Callimachus, with only one 10-line erotic epigram (out of 13 erotic epigrams, and out of 58 poems in all), or even from Posidippus with four 10-liners, one 12-liner and three 14-liners out of 124 complete poems; and none of these poets' longer pieces is erotic or sympotic. Although overall, however, Callimachus' 4-liners greatly outnumber his 6-liners, within his erotic poems the 6-liners (eight) are twice as many as the four-liners (four). The fanciers of 4-liners for erotic and sympotic epigram are just Asclepiades, with twenty erotic 4-liners and five erotic 6-liners, and Posidippus, with nine erotic 4-liners and two erotic 6-liners—an interestingly different distribution from the poems in the Milan papyrus with forty-five 4-liners followed closely by thirty-eight 6-liners (and a substantial group of eleven 8-liners).

To simplify: for Asclepiades and Posidippus the 4-liner is by far the most favored form for erotic epigrams, with the 6-liner trailing; for Callimachus and Hedylus it is the 6-liner, with the 4-liner trailing. One sympotic poem of Asclepiades and one of Posidippus has 8 lines; one erotic poem of Callimachus and two sympotic poems of Hedylus reach 10 lines; one sympotic poem of Asclepiades reaches 12, and nothing longer in the categories erotic or sympotic is found.

Does this question of length advance our understanding of the relationship between the Hellenistic epigrams and early elegy? It is clear, I think, that none of the four poets can be seen as following or trying to replicate the form of early erotic and sympotic elegy as a whole. There is nothing sympotic to match the 30 lines of Euenus (*Theognidea* 667–82), 28 lines of Theognis (237–54), or 24 lines of Xenophanes (1 W), nothing erotic comparable to the 20 lines and more of Simonides 22 W². That said, the single 12-line erotic poem (Asclepiades), like Callimachus' single 10-line erotic poem and Hedylus' two 10-line sympotic poems, have precedents in early elegy, and we cannot exclude the possibility of a large number of early elegiac ἐρωτικά circulating

²⁹ As pointed out to me by Peter Bing, however, the predominance of 4-liners by the other poets may to some extent reflect a preference of Meleager in making selections for his *Garland*, and the predominance of 6-liners by Hedylus may have something to do with the preferences of Athenaeus (who also seems inclined to cite the longer poems of Posidippus).

as 4-liners, and an erotic piece of Mimnermus and several other sympotic pieces circulating as 6-liners. In terms of length the four poets can be seen as choosing within the tradition known to them. Crucially, of course, the presentation of their poems as ἐπιγράμματα, circulating alongside dedicatory and sepulchral “epigrams” whose early models much more often privileged brevity, contributed to that choice excluding longer sympotic and erotic pieces.

What, then, of the Hellenistic poems’ circulation in epigram books, which has just been mentioned; of the relation of such circulation to first performance; and of the extent to which this might have been seen to differentiate them from early elegy?

In this discussion I assume that some sympotic and erotic epigrams of these four poets first saw the light of day in a recitation at a symposium and others in a written copy sent to a friend (addressed in the vocative as if present); that poems which had begun life in either medium might be resurrected, possibly many times, in the other; and that all or most poems which had initially been “published” in these ways were gathered by their poets into collections, collections upon which the poets might reasonably expect their poetic immortality to depend and upon which their initial composition of a poem had always had an eye. These propositions are discussed elsewhere in this volume, and of course do not command universal assent.

It seems overwhelmingly likely that what claimed to be individual collections of elegiac poems existed by the fifth century B.C. for some early poets: Archilochus, Callinus, Tyrtaeus, Mimnermus, Solon, Theognis, Anacreon, Simonides, Euenus. In some cases the collection is likely to have had so few erotic or sympotic poems (Archilochus? Callinus? Tyrtaeus? Solon?) that it could hardly have constituted any sort of model. In another case, that of Simonides, there may well have been several sympotic or erotic poems, but these may have been less prominent than other pieces, or at least not numerous enough to establish the flavor of a collection: one possible inference from the two (seemingly identical) books of Simonidean elegy from second-century A.D. Oxyrhynchus is that Simonides’ surviving erotic and sympotic poems were few enough (at least by then) to circulate in the same roll as quite long poems on Artemisium and Plataea.³⁰

³⁰ Cf. Boedeker and Sider (2001).

The cases of Mimnermus, Theognis and Euenus are (again) of prime interest. Callimachus knew two books of Mimnerman poetry, the *Nanno* and the *Smyrneis*, the latter a poem on the recent and perhaps also the early history of Smyrna, the former a collection of more admirable utterances on a small scale (αἱ κατὰ λεπτὸν ῥήσεις, *Aetia* fr. 1.11–12 Pf.). Whether this was put together by Mimnermus in his composing lifetime (which seems to me perfectly plausible) or was assembled later, e.g., by Antimachus of Colophon,³¹ it will have offered a model of a poetic book held together (to judge from Hermesianax) by the theme of sexual desire (cf. fr. 1 and 5 W), by a poetic *persona* (obsessed by the threat of old age, fr. 1 to 6 W) and perhaps by the address of at least some poems to Nanno and to an even more shadowy male figure Examyas, known only from Hermesianax fr. 7.38.

The use of address to a named individual to hold together a collection, conjectural for Mimnermus, is certain for Theognis: but the addressee, Cyrnus, albeit he may be a boy, παῖς, is never addressed as such, and although in one poem (237–56) he is presented as the singer's beloved, ἐρώμενος, no Theognidean collection built around the poems addressed to Cyrnus that are to be found in the transmitted *Theognidea* would have sounded or read like an erotic or even a sympotic collection.³² Although, therefore, sympotic sequences in parts of Book One of the *Theognidea* may go back to some pre-Hellenistic elegiac collection, this is not a collection that seems to have presented itself as exclusively poetry of Theognis or whose shape (if one had any chance of reconstituting it) would be likely to be articulated around poems addressed to Theognis' addressee Cyrnus.

Finally Euenus. There is, necessarily, some circularity in what follows. The address of three poems in the *Theognidea* to a Simonides has been taken (correctly, in my view) as a basis for ascribing all three to the author to whom one line's quotation (472) by Aristotle (*Metaphysics* Δ 1015a28) and Plutarch (*Moralia* 1102c) seems securely to ascribe

³¹ As suggested by West (1974: 75–6).

³² A different conclusion would follow if, as suggested to me by Peter Bing and argued in an unpublished paper by Thomas Schmitz, the stance adopted by Theognis towards Cyrnus in 237–54 entitles or encourages a reader or listener to interpret all songs addressed to Cyrnus as implicitly those of an *erastes* to an *eromenos*. That Cyrnus is not once described or addressed as a παῖς and that none of the poems addressed to him goes beyond the pronouncement of γνώμαι concerning ἔρωος (and that only 1353–6 in “Book Two”) seem to me to count very strongly against this interpretation.

467–96.³³ If this reasoning is correct, then there were in circulation poems of Euenus, as likely as not in a collection in which several were addressed to the same person, Simonides. That Euenus in, it seems, the 440s, might already know some form of collection of Mimnermus and Theognis seems probable. He may well have used the address of some poems to Simonides as one way of holding the collection together. If, however, *Theognidea* 903–30, addressed to one Democles, is also by Euenus, as has been suggested,³⁴ then he did not use only one addressee; and if the collection is the same as or partly overlaps that of ἐρωτικά later known to Artemidorus (*Onir.* 1.4) then a third addressee, Eunomus, must be added. That the collection might have embraced ἐρωτικά, sympotic poems (467–96) and more general reflections (667–82, 903–30), and that at least the last two categories were represented by longer poems, together suggest it was not an influential model for our four Hellenistic poets. But if there were any truth in the suggestion made above that the ἐρωτικά of *Theognidea* Book Two, many apparently transmitted as 4-liners, might in some way be linked with Euenus, then his importance would increase.

Once again the nature of the influence of early elegy is obscured by our uncertainty about basic facts. Our knowledge is, and is likely to remain, too lacunose to determine whether any collection of an individual singer's elegies may have been so designed as to encourage a reader to read adjacent or sequential songs one against another. We can indeed detect some such arrangements in the *Theognidea*, but that is not a collection of an individual singer's work. We can also be confident from accounts of classical *symposia* such as that in Aristophanes' *Wasps* that capping of one singer's contribution by the person who sang next was regular sympotic practice. What we cannot tell is whether the few possible sequences in the *Theognidea* go back to a *variorum* collection which directly mirrored sympotic practice or whether in any case two successive songs on the same theme were by the same composer and their juxtaposition goes back to a collection of that individual's songs.

One last issue will be dealt with briefly. Some scholars have noted close similarities of detail in themes or phraseology between Hellenistic

³³ The proposal goes back as far as Camerarius (1551); van Groningen (1966: 198) and Gerber (1999a: 243–5) are cautious.

³⁴ Cataudella (1956).

epigram and archaic or classical elegy.³⁵ As Vetta has pointed out, it is hard if not impossible to demonstrate deliberate allusion given how much early elegy and other early sympotic and erotic poetry we have lost. Set alongside the other phenomena that have been discussed such possible reworkings can slightly strengthen the case for the four epigrammatists seeing themselves as in some respects reworking the early elegiac tradition. But as almost everywhere in Hellenistic literature, refashioning—not following in footsteps—is the term that best seems to describe the phenomena.

³⁵ Notably Giangrande (1968).

SYLLOGE SIMONIDEA

David Sider

Sylloge Simonidea (hereafter *Syll.Sim.*) is the name given by modern scholarship to a no-longer-extant collection—or, more likely, collections—of epigrams which went under the name of Simonides; that is, Simonides is the purported author of all the epigrams contained therein.¹ It would have been from one or more such *syllogae*, perhaps only the latest, that Meleager, ca. 100 B.C., chose a significant number for his *Garland*, from which in turn some equally unknown fraction was selected for the *GA*.² This last batch, together with some others

¹ Although this phrase serving as title gained currency thanks to its frequent use by Boas (1905), it or something close to it can be found in earlier scholars; cf. Kaibel (1873: 451) “*Simonideorum epigrammatum... syllogen*” and “*sylloge Simonidea*,” Hiller (1889: 231), Stadtmüller (1894–1906: 2. lxxxiii, 356, which was published in 1899). Other scholars were satisfied with such vague words as *fasciculus*, *collectio*, *editio*, *Sammlung*, *recueil*, and, among scholars writing in Latin, even *sylloge* (simpliciter), intended not as a title but merely as a synonym for any of the preceding words. For some recent surveys of the problem involved in the transmission of Simonides’ epigrams, see Gentili (1968), Petrovic (2007), Bravi (2005), all with full references to earlier literature.

² I am convinced by Cameron (1993: 49–56) that Meleager’s *Garland* is to be dated to ca. 100–90 B.C. My use of the word “pre-Meleagrian” is to be understood accordingly. The term *GA* applies to the union of three ms. collections, all abridgements of the anthology assembled by Constantine Cephalas at the beginning of the tenth century: (i) the *Anthologia Planudea* (now in Venice, with copies elsewhere), (ii) the *Anthologia Palatina* (mostly in Heidelberg, with one part in Paris), and (iii) the *Sylloge Euphemia*, of which several ms. abridgements are extant; for Simonides we need mention only Σ^I and *Syll.E*, on which see Cameron (1993: ch. 11). Gow-Page (1965) and (1968), in their attempt to gather the poems from the original anthologies of Meleager and Philip, respectively, not only arranged the epigrams by author, they also printed epigrams by these authors known from other sources. They thus included epigrams found only in the minor *syllogae* which presumably were in Meleager’s and Philip’s anthologies; neither Beckby (1957–8) nor Paton (1916–9) do so. Page (1981) followed his and Gow’s earlier practice; hence his assemblage of epigrams in the “Simonides” section (his quotes) comprises (almost; see nn. 5 and 10 below) all epigrams ascribed to him in antiquity, as well as some epigrams that Page found convenient to include in this section, even though they are ascribed to Simonides neither by any ancient source nor by Page himself. Hence, just as Gow-Page (1965) added Theocritus even though Meleager did not include him, Page’s collection is a useful, although perhaps too generous, modern approximation to an ancient *sylloge Simonidea*. “Simonides,” therefore, rather than Simonides, is the author of this section of Page (1981), since nobody believes them all to be genuine, or even to have been included under Simonides’ name in antiquity. Page’s too-generous criteria for inclusion in his “Simonides” section was criticized by West (1978: 1).

assigned to Simonides by other sources, conveniently gathered by Bergk, Page, and Campbell, can be thought of as modern *Syllogae Simonideae*. The epigrams contained therein represent the usual genres of fifth-century inscribed epigrams: funerary (whether for a group or an individual), agonistic, votive, and dedicatory; as well as some that were transmitted as *viva voce ad-libitum* verses (riddles and jokes).

Although we shall continue to refer to various theoretically possible collections of this sort with the name *Sylloge/ae Simonidea/ae*, as is conventional in current scholarship, we should note that there was no book entitled *Συλλογὴ Σιμωνιδεία* in antiquity, as the word *συλλογή* was not applied to literary works until Byzantine times, and even then only in the senses *ἐπιτομή* or *ἐκλογή*.³ In late classical times, the collection was referred to simply as *Σιμωνίδου Ἐπιγράμματα*, and this surely would have been the original name of any earlier such collection,⁴ although we must remember that in the fifth century B.C. the word *ἐπίγραμμα* was limited to poems actually inscribed on stone monuments or tripods, which seems to leave out in the cold several short extemporaneous elegiac or epigrammatic verse compositions attributed to Simonides.⁵

The question frequently asked at this point is whether it would have been at all possible for any editor, even in the fifth century, to know which inscriptional epigrams, all of which were anonymous *in situ*, were in fact written by Simonides. The first *Syll. Sim.* may have already mixed genuine poems with those in his style. And if indeed there was any such collection as early as the late fifth century,⁶ it is necessary to

³ Nor is its calque in classical Latin, *collectio*, used this way. For Byzantine usage, cf. Constantine Porphyrogenitus' title, *Συλλογὴ τῆς περὶ ζώων ἱστορίας* [sc. Ἀριστοτέλους], which has the alternate title Ἀριστοφάνους [sc. Βυζαντινίου] τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους περὶ ζώων *ἐπιτομή* (*Excerptorum Constantini de Natura Animalium libri duo*, ed. S. P. Lambros; *CAG Suppl.* 1.1); and Photius 114a19–b22 speaks of a philosophical *sylloge* comprising *ἐκ τε τῶν ἐκλογῶν καὶ τῶν ἀποφθεγμάτων καὶ τῶν ὑποθηκῶν δόξας τε καὶ χρήσεις καὶ χρεῖας*. In English the earliest recorded use as a title is 1787 (*A Sylloge of...Inscriptions*); *OED s.v.*

⁴ Cf. Heph. *Ench.* 4.6 quoting 1 *FGE* *ἐκ τῶν ἐπιγραμμάτων*, Trypho *Περὶ Τρόπων* quoting 44 *FGE* *ἐν ἐπιγράμμασιν*, and Stobaeus 1.8.22 quoting 89 *FGE* from Simonides' *ἐπιγράμματα*.

⁵ Such as 26 W οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδ' εὐρύς περ ἔδον ἐξίκετο δεῦρο, a parody of *Il.* 14.33. The four-line dactylic poem cited by Athenaeus 456c is ignored in Page's *PMG* and *FGE* and West's *IEG*, but may be found as Simonides 172 Bergk. Cf. Puelma (1996: 125–5).

⁶ Currently a minority view, but one that will be argued below. For the usual view, cf., e.g., Page (1981: 122–3): "A collection of early inscriptional epigrams was made, probably early in the Hellenistic period, and circulated under the name of Simonides. This collection was republished on several occasions... during the Hellenistic period, and the new editions were augmented by the inclusion of Hellenistic compositions deliberately put into circulation under the name of Simonides... This process may have continued up to, or near, the time of Meleager."

imagine that it increased in time as others (some of them manifestly for one reason or another not by Simonides) were added; or perhaps that there were more than one “Simonidean” collection for Meleager to choose from, one of which was, if not genuine, then at least limited to fifth-century inscriptions.

The starting point for our investigation are the extant epigrams ascribed to Simonides with whatever level of credibility by ancient sources.⁷ These are 102 in number, eighty occurring in the *GA* (many of which are also cited, with or without author’s name in other sources; see Table I, p. 129)⁸ and twenty-two ascribed to Simonides by various authors but which do not appear in the *GA* (Table II, p. 130).⁹ These latter, too, could have formed part of the *Syll.Sim.* available to Meleager, but which he either chose to ignore or which, if selected, were ignored later in the development of the *GA*. It has to be said, though, that a significant number of the eighty epigrams in the *GA* have double ascriptions and that Page and others are surely right to consider many of these not only to be the work of someone other than Simonides but not even belonging to any Simonidean *sylloge*.¹⁰

⁷ Some of the items in the numeration that follows may in fact be from elegies, a problem especially acute when only a short passage is cited. Another problem, not here properly addressed, is the precise meaning of “epigram,” a term applied by later authors to some elegiac expostulations attributed to Simonides; i.e., the Hellenistic notion of oral ad-libitum epigrams is anachronistically applied to Simonides; cf. Gentili (1968: 40–1).

⁸ Three epigrams, present but anonymous in the *GA* are ascribed to Simonides only by others: 18 *FGE* = *AP* 7.257 (Σ Aristid.), 10 = *AP* 7.347 (Favorinus = Ps.-Dio Prus.), and 6 = *AP* 7.677 (Hdt. 7.228.3).

⁹ In *AP*, the hexastich *AP* 7.22 (where it is ascribed to Simias (5 GP)), in a run of epigrams ascribed to Simonides, follows the Simonidean 7.20 without a break to form one eight-line epigram. Since the latter (and the two together) in tombstone fashion describe the death of Sophocles (dead long after Simonides), neither can be by Simonides, but Iriarte (1769: 95), knowing only *AP*, argued that 7.22 was also by Simonides. It may be worth pointing out that three of the epigrams ascribed to Simonides in Table II (and none in Table I) are extant in inscriptions as well as in literary texts: 1, 11, 16 *FGE*.

¹⁰ For the problem in general, see Gow (1958a). The following nine doubly ascribed epigrams are excluded from “Simonides” by Page: *AP* 5.161 (Asclepiades 40 GP); 6.144 (Anacreon 15 *FGE*); 7.187 (Philip 77 GP *Garland*), 345 (Aeschion 1 GP), 507a (Alexander 1 *FGE*), 508 (Empedocles 1 *FGE*), 647 (Simias 7 GP); 9.147 (Antagoras 2 GP); 13.28 (Antigenes 1 *FGE*), and 30. Three further epigrams are totally excluded not only from *FGE*, but also from the classical and Hellenistic canon of epigrams established by Gow-Page (1965) and (1968): (i) *AP* 6.216, the famous hexametric distich Σῶσος καὶ Σῶσώ κτλ., which the mss. ascribe only to Simonides. (That this epigram occurs in a run of epigrams ascribed to Simonides, 6.212–17, proves nothing, since it is during runs such as these that errors of ascription are likely to occur, as Gow (1958a) shows.); (ii) 7.349, a pale imitation of the preceding epigram in *AP*, “Simonides” 37 *FGE*, to

Parallels are presented by other books of similar nature, that is, the *Hymns of Homer*, the *Elegies of Theognis*, and the *Poems of Anacreon*. But even this small sample displays a wide range of possibilities. The Homeric Hymns and the *Theognidea* (another modern title), though, started as books ascribed to one author (falsely so in the case of Homer, but the near-mythical status of Homer as author makes this a special case), to which other, similar, poems were added by people who knew the poems were not genuine. We should, therefore, keep open the possibility that some time in the fifth century a core collection of epitaphs by Simonides was produced and published under his name.¹¹ If we pursue this possibility, we have to raise the question again of how his authorship of anonymous epigrams erected throughout the Greek world could be known.¹² This question is usually understood as a rhetorical one; that is, nobody could know authorship; hence (i) the inscriptions were anonymous when collected, so that (ii) if any are indeed by Simonides, we can never know this for sure.¹³

which it is united by P, but separated and ascribed to Simonides only by C (the Corrector to P), who is usually wiser than this (cf. Page *FGE* 253); (iii) 13.30, a two-line epigram ascribed to Simonides in which the second line rearranges the words of the preceding hexameter to form a trochaic tetrameter catalectic. Since Page elsewhere includes epigrams not strictly in elegiac couplets (including "Simonides" 35, 36, 43, 50, 54 *FGE*, and the above-listed Antigones 1 *FGE*), it seems odd that he excluded (i), in hexameters, and (iii) without explanation.

¹¹ That there was a fifth-century collection of Homeric hymns I hope to argue elsewhere.

¹² Potters and (if not the same person) vase painters were not so reticent, frequently writing their names on their vases throughout the fifth century. Similarly, sculptors would often name themselves. Some of these inscriptions on pots and statue bases are in verse; e.g., 436 = 437 *CEG* Ἐχσέκίας ἔγραψε κάποιός ἐμέ, an iambic trimeter. See further Wallace (1984: 309).

¹³ Reitzenstein (1893: 116). The only inscription of the fifth century to identify the author is *CEG* 888, ca. 400 B.C., which names Symmachus of Pellana (see Hansen (1989) *ad loc.*, titulus ii). Ion of Samos (*CEG* 819) appears to be somewhat later; see Hansen (1989) *ad loc.*; *contra* Page (1981: 120, n. 2). Bergk, though, adduces the ascription by Stephanus of Byzantium of an inscription honoring the action of the Thespians during the Persian Wars to an otherwise unknown poet Philiadēs of Megara (3.19 Cougny = 23 Preger); that is, it would not even have been local pride on the part of the Thespians to have recalled the name of a Megarian poet, and his obscurity seems to guarantee the genuineness of the ascription. Cf. Bergk (1914: 428, 431), Bravi (2005: 4–5). Note, however, that Stephanus does not explicitly say that Philiadēs' name appeared on the stone (nor with three consecutive short syllables could it have formed part of the verse itself); conceivably Stephanus' source depended on a local history for this information.

Inscriptions known only from literary sources outside the *GA* tend not to be collected by the editors of verse inscriptions (Kaibel, Peek, Friedländer-Hoffleit, Pfohl,

There can, though, be another answer. Simonides was not merely the most famous composer of epitaphs; he was also famous for his lyric and elegiac poems, which we know were available for purchase (and unfortunately for Phidippides, also for study) in the fifth century.¹⁴ We do not have to give credence to the stories of Simonides' greed (in any case, he made his money from commissions, not from his books), but to his vainglory the poems themselves supply ample evidence, since he frequently compares himself favorably to his predecessors.¹⁵ Ignorant as we clearly are about the details of publishing in the classical period, it remains quite possible that an original collection of epitaphs by Simonides was gathered and made available for publication by Simonides himself. Afterwards, this edition would have suffered from the same additions and no doubt rearrangements that we see in the books entitled *Hymns of Homer* and *Elegies of Theognis*. Some of the additions may even have been written by Simonides; that is, excerpted short passages from elegies may have been inserted into his epigram book, perhaps because their origin was no longer known.¹⁶ Also arguing for an original collection of Simonides' poems is the inclusion, to judge from what was published under his name by Meleager (to the extent this is discernible in the *GA*), of poems that do not even pretend to be epitaphs, such as the *paignia* and *griphoi*.¹⁷

Hansen, et al.), who limit themselves to actual lapidary examples. They can be found, however, in Preger (1891) and in E. Cougny's *Appendix* to Dübner's edition of the *GA* (Cougny 1927), which Page (1981: xiii) unfairly called "an almost useless book." See 3.19 Cougny for the Thespian inscription.

¹⁴ Phidippides in Aristophanes' *Clouds* and Socrates and Protagoras in Plato's *Protagoras* give ample evidence of Simonides' wide-spread acceptance as a vehicle of education and moral instruction.

¹⁵ On the legends surrounding Simonides, see Christ (1941: 53–78).

¹⁶ Thus, *eleg.* 88 W (= *ep.* 89 *FGE*), ὁ τοι Χρόνος ὄξυς ὀδόντας | καὶ πάντα νήχει καὶ τὰ βιαίότατα ("Sharp-toothed Time chills everything, even the most vigorous"), may, as West and others suspect, come from an elegy, even though Stobaeus 1.8.22 found it among Simonides' *Ἐπιγράμματα*. Similarly [Plut.] *Malign. Hdt.* 36.869c may be wrong to identify 19 *FGE* as an epigram (because he found it in a collection entitled *Ἐπιγράμματα*?), since it reads more like a narrative than inscriptions normally do ("neither sepulchral nor dedicatory," Page (1981) ad loc.). The description of the Naxian general Democritus' success at Salamis contains details (he destroyed five ships and saved a Naxian ship from capture) that would bulk too large in a complete four-line poem, but this could simply be the mark of a bad poet; cf. 45 *FGE*, also a narrative but specifically identified as a dedicatory inscription by D.S. 11.62.3. On the relationship between epigram and elegy, see Gentili (1968).

¹⁷ For this argument, see Hauvette (1896: 18).

Here then are some possible ways in which the *Syll. Simon.* began and developed.

1a. Simonides himself prepared an edition of his inscriptional poems, which went under the simple descriptive heading or title of Σιμωνίδου Ἐπιγράμματα.¹⁸ This could have been published in the way that was usual in the fifth century (whatever that was);¹⁹ or, as I think also possible, Simonides could have prepared a “sample book” from which potential customers could pick one or more favorites to serve as models for their own inscriptions. If the latter, it was produced in multiple copies, but its contents would have altered over time, as Simonides wrote more and added to it.

1b. Rather than limiting himself in this book to inscriptions, Simonides published all his short poems, including *paignia* and *griphoi*. In this case, however, it is unlikely that its fifth-century title was Ἐπιγράμματα, a word that does not include noninscriptional poems until later.²⁰

2. After the death of Simonides, his book would be at the mercy of editors who, as in the case of the books of Homer, Theognis, and Anacreon, add (and subtract) at will. Collected under Simonides’ name would be poems both inscriptional (in form, if not in fact) and

¹⁸ This was argued by Preger (1891: xxi–xxii), who was also willing to have the collection formed by a relative (*cognatus*), possibly even his nephew Bacchylides. Preger was followed by Hiller (1889) and Sitzler (1893: 225) and (1897: 132), and even more forcefully by Erbse (1998), but was criticized by Reitzenstein (1893: 107), who preferred a date in the fourth century, arguing that Theopompus’ citing an epigram of Simonides demonstrates a link with his teacher Isocrates (116). Reitzenstein was criticized in turn for positing too early a date by those who argue for an initial composition shortly before Meleager; e.g. Page (1981: 122–3). Argentieri (1998: 3) argues for a date toward the end of the fourth century.

¹⁹ But publication there was, of literary and scientific prose and of poetry. Thus, the statements that there were no fifth-century *epigram* books are overly dogmatic; cf. Fraser (1972: 607), Petrovic (2007: 91–2).

²⁰ See Gentili (1968). Aelius Aristides may have had access to a complete edition of Simonides, since in *or.* 49 Περὶ τοῦ παραφθέγματος, in the space of three pages (2.510–13 Dind.) he speaks of Simonides not only as a writer of epinicians (comparing him explicitly with Pindar) but he also quotes from six epigrams (21, 38, 45, 3, 22a, 12 *FGE*, three of which, 45, 22a, and 12 *FGE*, are explicitly ascribed to Simonides in *GA*), ending with another reference to Simonides and a quote from a lyric poem that many but by no means all take to be by Simonides (adespota 947a–b *PMG*). Of the epigrams, Aristides attributes only one, the first, explicitly to Simonides; and three of them are quoted elsewhere only anonymously. But the Simonidean framing of these pages and the flow of the rhetoric strongly suggests that Aristides meant all the epigrams as well as the lyric passage to be taken as works of Simonides; so Bergk (1914: 442–3), *contra* Hiller (1889), Boas (1905: 92–6) and Page (1981: 253). Still, this would have been an Alexandrian edition of course, not a fifth-century original.

others, more sympotic in nature, which either were found ascribed to him or, as in the case of the inscriptional ones, seemed appropriate, or at any rate convenient, to include in a Simonidean volume. As in the case of Theognis, there may have been more than one *Sylloge* in circulation, from any one of which or from all Meleager could have made his selection.²¹ Does the *Sylloge* disappear at this point? It is not from Meleager's *Garland* that Athenaeus, Plutarch, Hephaestion, and Stobaeus get the epigrams they ascribe to Simonides, but they may well have found them in intermediate sources that in turn excerpted them from a Simonidean book that now had, if it did not before, the title Ἐπίγραμματα.

In this conjectural history of the *Syll.Sim.*, which begins with a book of genuine Simonidean epigrams (or all his short poems), it seems unlikely, though still possible, that by Meleager's time none of the genuine poems remained. The skepticism that led Junghahn (1869), Page, and others to accept only one epigram as genuine seems excessive. Does, though, the hypothesis that at least some of the epigrams under Simonides' name are genuine get us anywhere in itself?²² If no one epigram is known for sure to be genuine, there can be no criterion against which to judge the rest. Moreover, even if, say, five poems were universally accepted as genuine, each is so short that a sufficient statistical basis for judging authenticity would be lacking. Not that this stops people. Page, for example, damns one epigram in his "Simonides" section for its violation of Naeke's law (84.1 *FGE*), but since all composers of hexameter from Homer on allow themselves an occasional lapse in the observance of this and other such metrical "laws," Simonides cannot absolutely be denied this epigram, especially since he felt free, as we can see elsewhere, to compose metrical oddities, some of a quite striking sort, some merely violating the metrical norms we mistakenly call laws.²³ What about "Simonides" 75 *FGE*? Page ad loc., following others, rejects both its epigrammatic nature and Simonidean authorship

²¹ On the complex development of the *Theognidea*, see West (1974: ch. 3), Bowie (1997).

²² Almost everybody who writes on these epigrams considers the question of authenticity. Note in particular Hauvette (1896), Setti (1900), and Boas (1905). For a survey of the scholarship on this question, see Petrovic (2007: 22–51).

²³ Cf. Sider (2001: 275, n. 4) for the more noticable ones, including 1 *FGE*, which has a great claim to Simonidean authorship and which contains the more noteworthy syllabic division of the name Ἀριστο-|γείτων between vv. 1 and 2.

for its unparalleled address by a viewer to someone close to, perhaps the father of, the deceased:

σῆμα καταφθιμένοιο Μεγακλέος εἶτ' ἄν ἴδωμαι,
οἰκτίρω σὲ, τάλαν Καλλία, οἶ' ἔπαθες.

Whenever I see the tomb of Megacles, who perished, I pity you, Callias,
for what you suffered.

“One may look through a couple of thousand of epitaphs of all periods without finding anything comparable” (Page 1981: 295). But two grave monuments do in fact contain quite close parallels. (i) Αὐτοκλείδου τόδε σῆμα νέου προσορῶν ἀνιῶμαι (“I grieve when I look upon this grave of Autoclides”) and (ii) οἰκτίρω προσορῶν παιδὸς τόδε σῆμα θανόντος | Σμικύθου (“I feel pity when I look upon this grave of the dead Smicythus”).²⁴

Can any deviations from the norms offer guidance? Of the lesser metrical oddities among the epigrams perhaps the most interesting is elision at the bucolic diaeresis, since this occurs not only in 1 *FGE* (see above, note 23), but also at 29.1 and 55.1 *FGE*. Yet, while there are three instances in the *Syll.Sim.*, they are quite uncommon elsewhere: only twice elsewhere in *FGE*, ten times in all of *GP*, and thrice in *GP Garland*.²⁵ Can it be that the three “Simonides” epigrams are indeed by Simonides? 29 *FGE* is quoted only by Pausanias 6.9.9, who calls it δεξιότατον:²⁶

πατρίς μὲν Κόρκυρα, Φίλων δ' ὄνομ', εἰμὶ δὲ Γλαύκου
υἱός, καὶ νικῶ πῦξ δὺ' Ὀλυμπιάδας.

Homeland: Corcyra; Philo's the name; I'm the son of Glaucus and twice
I've been a boxing winner at the Olympic games.

Page is impressed enough to say that “the lapidary style rings authentic” and that it “may well come from his [sc. Simonides] time,” and it is very tempting to agree with Bergk and Molyneux in considering it authentic.

What about 55 *FGE*, though, which is one of the two Simonidean epigrams preserved only in the *syllogae minores* of *GA*?

²⁴ (i) published by Matthaïou (1986: 32–4), = *CEG* 470 = *IG* 1³ 1219; (ii) *CEG* 51 = *IG* 1³ 1273 *bis*. Both are printed by Lewis (1987), who points out the parallel with “Simonides” 75 *FGE*. On *CEG* 51, see Ecker (1990: 161–7). Sitzler (1900: 130) had earlier given much the same reason as Page for damning this epigram.

²⁵ See Gow-Page (1968: l.xlii).

²⁶ On Pausanias' use of epigrams, see Chamoux (2001).

δῆμος Ἀθηναίων σε, Νεοπτόλεμ', εἰκόνι τῇδε
τίμησ' εὐνοίης εὐσεβίης θ' ἔνεκα.

The Athenian demos honored you, Neoptolemus, with this statue in recognition of your good will and piety.

Page and earlier editors assume without question that this Neoptolemus is the son of Anticles who was honored by Athens in the fourth century with a crown (Kirchner *PA* 10652; see also Davies (1971: *ad numerum*). The metrics, we have seen, points to Simonides, and there is nothing in the language to suggest otherwise. It is tempting to consider it genuine. Unfortunately, however, it appears that only one historical person was named Neoptolemus before the fourth century; cf. *LGPV* 1–4 s.v. Νεοπτόλεμος.²⁷ Metrics may point but it cannot determine. There is no reason, though, to follow Schneidewin, who argued for a late, Roman, composition, for εὐνοίης ἔνεκα has a good fourth-century pedigree.²⁸

If metrics, then, is a feeble reed on which to support an argument for or against authenticity, external evidence is all but nonexistent. It is true that Thucydides 1.132.2 quotes, without naming an author, an epigram inscribed on a tripod dedicated by Pausanias in the Temple of Apollo in Delphi to celebrate his victory over the Persians (17a *FGE*)—

Ἑλλάνων ἀρχαγός, ἐπεὶ στρατὸν ὤλεσε Μήδων,
Πανσανίας Φοῖβφ μνάμ' ἀνέθηκε τόδε.

Ruler of the Greeks, Pausanias, after he destroyed the host of Medes, dedicated this monument to Apollo.

—an epigram that is ascribed to Simonides by Pausanias 3.8.2 and *AP* 6.197. The evidence of the *GA*, however, is worthless for ascertaining Simonidean authorship. Pausanias the Periegete may be another matter, as elsewhere (29 *FGE*; see above) he quotes an epigram he credits to Simonides but which is omitted in the *GA*. This need not, however, entail that Pausanias had access to a better source than Meleager; indeed, conceivably he could have used exactly the same *Sylloge* that Meleager did, but either Meleager chose not to excerpt 29 *FGE* or, if he did, it was lost by the time of the compilation of the *GA*. Since Simonides

²⁷ The exception is a Macedonian mentioned among many others in *IG* 1³ 89.62, recording a peace treaty with Perdiccas that dates most likely to 417–13 B.C.; cf. Meiggs (1972: 428–30).

²⁸ Demosthenes was so honored (18.54); cf. *IG* 2².212.30–33, the demos honors two brothers ἀρετῆς καὶ εὐνοίας ἔνεκα.

writes favorably of King Pausanias in the “New Simonides” elegies, Hornblower is now disposed to accept Simonidean authorship for 17a *FGE*,²⁹ but anyone Pausanias hired to do the job would know that payment depended on praising him. In other words, the combination of early but anonymous citation and later (post-*Sylloge*, or, perhaps better, post-Meleager) attribution counts for little.

Only two epigrams are both quoted and attributed to Simonides by fifth- and fourth-century authors, neither without its own problems. The first is Herodotus, who at 7.228 quotes three inscriptions for the dead at Thermopylae; one for all the Peloponnesians (22a *FGE*), another for the Spartans alone (22b *FGE*, the famous ὦ ξεῖν’, ἀγγέλλειν Λακεδαιμονίοις), and a third for the seer Megistias, who, although urged by Leonidas to leave camp, died along with the rest (6 *FGE*):

μνήμα τόδε κλεινοῖο Μεγιστία, ὃν ποτε Μῆδοι
Σπερχειὸν ποταμὸν κτεῖναν ἀμειψάμενοι,
μάντιος, ὃς τότε Κῆρας ἐπερχομένας σάφα εἰδώς
οὐκ ἔτλη Σπάρτης ἡγεμόνας πρόλιπεῖν.

This is the tomb of the famous Megistias, whom the Medes killed after crossing the Spercheus river—the seer who, although he clearly saw the spirits of Death approaching, could not abandon the leaders of Sparta.³⁰

Herodotus says nothing about authorship of the first two—they are credited to Simonides by the *GA*, the latter also by Cicero—, but of the third he says τὸ δὲ τοῦ μάντιος Μεγιστίω Σιμωνίδης... ἔστι κατὰ ξεινίην ὁ ἐπιγράψας,³¹ a straightforward account with many interpretations. Although ἐπιγράφειν (act.) in a context like this means “commission an epigram” (and in any case nobody would think that Simonides took chisel in hand), there can be little doubt that no poet, least of all Simonides, would commission another to write a poem

²⁹ Hornblower (2004: 23–4).

³⁰ On this epigram, see also Petrovic in this volume.

³¹ Hdt. 5.102 named Simonides earlier as the author of an epinician in honor of Eualcides of Eretria’s victory (or victories) in the games. He also names other poets: 1.12 (Archilochus), 2.156 (Aeschylus), 3.38 (Pindar), 3.121 (Anacreon), 3.135 (Sappho), 4.32 (Hesiod, also at 2.53, and “Homer,” author of *Epigoni*), 5.95 (Alcaeus), 6.21 (Phrynichus tragicus). Homer is mentioned nine other times. All but Anacreon and Sappho are mentioned in connection with poems they had written. For a commentary on this poem, see Petrovic (2007: 231–6).

for him.³² Even the generally skeptical Page is willing to interpret the passage thus; he is not, however, ready to believe that Herodotus is correct.³³ His qualms are of the usual sort; that Herodotus' sources, here Spartans, could not have had knowledge of the author. Yet if stay-at-home Spartans told Herodotus that Simonides was the author, they would seem to be the most trustworthy of sources. They were not likely to be getting their information from an early *Syll.Sim.*, nor would the proud heirs of those who died at Thermopylae have felt the need to puff up Spartan bravery by falsely attributing to an Ionian poet any of the epigrams inscribed there.³⁴

Can we go further and say that if one of the epigrams was by Simonides, all three were? How & Wells (1928: 2.231) blithely say "doubtless Simonides composed all three inscriptions, but he had only one inscribed by his own cost." They are also accepted as genuine by Hauvette, Preger, Bergk, and Molyneux. It is tempting to agree with these fine scholars, but Herodotus, who elsewhere is not hesitant to identify poets with their works (see above, n. 30), is far from telling us what would have been so easy for him to do, that Simonides wrote these two other epigrams. All we can say is that Simonidean authorship is consistent with what Herodotus says. The attribution of the other two epigrams to Simonides in the *GA* may well derive from their being quoted immediately before Herodotus (all but) attributes the third to Simonides.

The only other author before Meleager to identify Simonides as the author of an epigram is Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1367b20), who quotes only the third line of an epigram quoted in full but anonymously by Thucydides 6.59.2 (= 26a *FGE*):

ἀνδρὸς ἀριστεύσαντος ἐν Ἑλλάδι τῶν ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ
Ἰππίου Ἀρχεδίκην ἦδε κέκευθε κόνις,

³² LSJ s.v. ἐπιγράφειν II misleadingly suggests that the subject of the verb in the active is the stone carver, but cf. Hdt. 3.88.3 and 4.88.1 where in both places Darius "inscribes" (ἐπέγραψε and ἐπιγράψας) an inscription. See Kühner-Gerth 1.99–100 for the use of the active where a middle might be expected.

³³ Page (1981: 196), "the implication of the context here and common sense make it virtually certain that Herodotus meant, or at least believed, that Simonides was indeed the author of the lines for whose inscriptions he was responsible."

³⁴ Even if Page (1981: 233) is justified in suspecting that Herodotus never visited Thermopylae, one can still maintain faith in his Spartan sources. Page even doubts whether Herodotus would have copied down the inscriptions he might have seen there, but he copied down from *some* source; why not from autopsy? On Herodotus' use of inscriptions, see S. West (1985), Higbie, (1999), Petrovic (2007).

ἡ πατρός τε καὶ ἀνδρὸς ἀδελφῶν τ' οὔσα τυράννων
παίδων τ' οὐκ ἤρθη νοῦν ἐς ἀτασθαλίην.

This earth covers Archedice, daughter of Hippias, the best of the men of his time in Greece. Although her father, husband, brothers, and children were tyrants, she did not let herself think foolish thoughts.

The absence of her husband's name (Aeantides) has been taken as proof that the poem is not genuine; i.e., not one that was actually inscribed on her tombstone.³⁵ Thucydides, however, was scrupulous in his use of inscriptions, once even commenting on the physical state of the inscribed letters.³⁶ Moreover, what evidence is there for fictional epitaphs in the fifth century?³⁷ Friedländer further argues that the striking similarity in structure between this and the Megistias epigram (a relative pronoun beginning v. 3 and a negated expression in v. 4) could indicate someone consciously imitating Simonides. Again, however, and more particularly, we have to ask what evidence there was in the fifth century not merely for fictional epitaphs but for literary parodies of epitaphs. Furthermore, since literary parody presupposes an audience familiar with the original, this would argue for a fifth-century *Syll.Sim.*, which is precisely *not* what those who question this poem are willing to accept. At the very least, Aristotle's naming of Simonides argues for a fourth-century *Syll.Sim.* The structural similarities with the Megistias epigram, which we have seen cannot be parody, go beyond coincidence and seem to favor Simonidean authorship.³⁸

³⁵ Hiller von Gaertringen (1926: 35), Friedländer and Hoffleit (1948: 128), Page (1981: 239). It is, however, defended by Lavelle (1986), who convincingly shows that it was composed between the death of Hippias in 490 and the last year Archedice's sons could have exercised power in Lampsacus, 464. (And if by Simonides, the inscription would antedate his death in 468.) See further Petrovic (2007: 251–2).

³⁶ 54.7. Cf. Gomme (1970: 324–5) on Thucydides' use of inscriptions in this section of his work, and who is willing to allow that Thucydides saw the Archedice inscription *in situ* in Lampsacus.

³⁷ On the origin of fictitious epigrams in early Hellenistic times, see Petrovic (2007: 19–24). On the various subtle “fictional” applications of epigrams, see Bing (1998). What may be a very early example of a fictitious epitaph is that of Thrasymachus of Chalcedon, presumably the famous sophist (died ca. 400 B.C.), which was stated by Neoptolemus of Parium in the third century B.C. (ap. Athen. 10.454f) actually to have been inscribed. The joking quality that convinced Page (1981: 430) that it was not genuine (the first line is τοῦνομα θῆτα ρῶ ἄλφα σάν ὃ μὲν ἄλφα χεῖ οὐ σάν, Anon. 24 *FGE*) does not seem altogether impossible for a sophist interested in language; see also Reitzenstein (1893: 118–20), who discusses this epigram in the context of some other joking ones.

³⁸ Boas (1905: 39) argues on the basis of the discrepant citations in Thucydides and Aristotle that the former did not and the latter did have access to a *sylloge Simonidea*;

Since it is only when someone uses the phrase ἐν τοῖς ἐπιγράμμασι *vel sim.* that we can be reasonably sure that he found the epigram in question in a *sylloge Simonidea*, we cannot know Aristotle's source. The same applies to other fourth-century authors who are credited by later authors with knowledge of an epigram by Simonides: Chamaeleon,³⁹ Theopompus, and Timaeus, all of whom seem to know the epigram on the Corinthian women, according to schol. Pi. *Ol.* 13.32b and Athen. 13.573c (= 14 *FGE*). The possibility cannot be ruled out that all three historians found it in yet another historian's work, one no longer extant. Thus, Boas' argument (1905: 73–4) that Athenaeus' version of the epigram derives from Timaeus, who found it in a *sylloge Simonidea* cannot stand; nor, *a fortiori*, does it follow that Timaeus can be used to provide a *terminus ante quem* for the publication of such a *sylloge*, which Boas would put toward the end of the third century.⁴⁰

Another possible *terminus ante quem* for the *Syll.Sim.*: Aristophanes of Byzantium (3–2 c. B.C.) ap. Eust. *Od.* 1761.25 cites 41 *FGE* anonymously (as does Aristotle *Rhet.* 1365a26) to illustrate the use of the rare word ἄσιλλα, a shoulder yoke with two dependent baskets. Gutzwiller (1998b: 51), adducing this, links this date with the rise of the Hellenistic literary epigram in the 270s, when “epigrams attributed to Simonides would have been sought out,” by which she means primarily from one or more earlier editions of a *sylloge Simonidea*. By this date it seems unreasonable to imagine that anyone could gather ca. one hundred epigrams attributed to Simonides from primary authors alone, for this would presuppose that the habit of falsely attributing epigrams to Simonides was endemic among almost as many authors (from Herodotus to Timaeus) as the “Simonidean” epigrams they quote.

By now, one sees the scope of the problem. Although many of the epigrams can be denied to Simonides for one reason or another (chiefly

his conclusion may well be correct, however worthless his argument. Only one other epigram seems to offer a pre-Melegagrian testimony for Simonides: *IG* 7.53 (= 16 *FGE*), a fourth-century A.D. inscription found in Megara that prefaces an epigram with the statement that “In honor of the city and the heroes who lost their lives in the Persian War and who are buried here, Helladios the chief priest ordered inscribed the epigram for them, but which was worn away by time. Simonides composed it.” Most editors are willing to accept the inscription as a faithful (however flawed) copy of a fifth-century original (Hiller von Gaertringen (1926: 13) believes that only the first distich is original), but it is all too likely that the attribution to Simonides derives from acquaintance with either a *sylloge Simonidea* or the *GA*, and hence is worthless as testimony.

³⁹ Who wrote a work περὶ Σιμωνίδου (fr. 41–3 Giordano = 33–5 Wehrli).

⁴⁰ Boas is criticized by Gutzwiller (1998b: 50–1).

on the grounds of language or historical reference), those that remain are either by Simonides, by one of his contemporaries, or by a later writer who either intentionally or for the most innocent of reasons wrote an epigram that, to the best of our knowledge, could have been written by Simonides. This is a situation that scholarship cannot be happy with, but it is difficult to see how it can be bettered. Even a papyrus discovery of Ptolemaic date with the title ΣΙΜΩΝΙΔΟΥ ΕΠΙΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ, while it would be a godsend for textual critics and surely a source of unknown epigrams, and while it would give us a *tranche* of the dynamic history of the *Syll.Sim.*, would not settle the question of which epigrams are by Simonides and which are not.⁴¹ Since we do not even know when the first *Sylloge* was formed, we cannot even say how many collections there were that would have deserved this name. If shortly before Meleager, then only one *Sylloge* existed, which would have minimal claim to contain genuine poems of Simonides. If, however, to go to the other extreme, Preger is right in having Simonides form his own epigram book (whether free standing or part of his *opera omnia*), there was, as the *GA* makes quite clear, accretion, probably over time. One can choose to imagine that at any one time there was only one *Sylloge* in existence, but it is probably more likely that as copies made their way from person to person and city to city, additions (and subtractions and rearrangements) to individual copies led to multiple versions of *Syllogae* in existence at the same time, from any one of which, or from more than one, Meleager made his selection for his *Garland*. The question of date is a factor in answering the second point of contention. The earlier one is willing to date the first *Syll.Sim.*, the more prepared one must be to accept in the abstract Simonidean authorship for individual epigrams, especially if a fifth-century edition by Simonides himself is deemed a reasonable possibility, as it is by Preger and others (including me).

⁴¹ One epigram frequently considered Simonidean by modern scholars ("Simonides" 3 *FGE*) appears in *POxy.* 31.2535, which seems to be a commentary on this and perhaps other epigrams. Its editor, E.G. Turner, notes the possible restoration Σ]ιμωνί|[δ-, which would be the only ancient testimony for Simonides as author of this famous epigram. An indication that this epigram is in fact by Simonides is Heraclitus B 43 D-K, ὕβριν χρῆ σβεννύναι μάλλον ἢ πυρκαϊήν, which seems to echo "Simonides" 3.1 *FGE*, ἔσβεσαν ὕβριν, a variation on Homer's σβέσσαι χόλον (*Il.* 9.678). This would closely parallel a borrowing by Heraclitus from an undisputed poem of Simonides: cf. Heraclitus B 29 D-K, κλέος ἀέναν with Simonides 531.9 *PMG* (on the fallen at Thermopylae) ἀέναν τε κλέος, once again a poetic variation on Homer (κλέος ἄφθιτον). Heraclitus died ca. 460; cf. Mouraviev (2003: 126–9). Although Heraclitus often writes as ambiguously as any poet, his vocabulary is usually closer to prose than poetry; in both cases the phrases in question are far more likely to have originated with a poet (whether or not Simonides is the author of 3 *FGE*).

Authorship aside, though, what can we say about form of the (or any) *Syll.Sim.*? A run of eleven Simonidean epigrams (*AP* 7.507–16, including 507b), the first eight of which are arranged alphabetically by first letter only, seems inconsistent with what we know of Meleager's arrangement, which tends to intersperse authors.⁴² Since this primitive form of alphabetical ordering has parallels in Hellenistic times, this run of eight almost certainly represents, as Stadtmüller (1894–1906) calls it in the margin of his edition at 7.507, a "*fragmentum Syllogae Simonideae*," which someone inserted into Meleager's *Garland* at a later date. In addition, any of the authors in Table II who cite epigrams not in the *GA* (and who do not explicitly credit pre-Meleagrian authors for their knowledge of Simonides) conceivably could have seen them in a still-extant *Syll.Sim.*, although it must be admitted that Trypho in the first century B.C.; Hephaestion,⁴³ Plutarch,⁴⁴ Herodianus, Aristides,⁴⁵ Athenaeus, and Pollux in the second century A.D.; and Diogenes Laertius in the third are more likely candidates than Stobaeus in the fifth and Eustathius and Tzetzes in the twelfth.⁴⁶

In sum, then, although the picture remains unclear, it still seems quite possible that an original collection of Simonides' epigrams, whether published separately (Ἐπιγράμματα Σιμωνίδου) or as part of his *opera omnia*, was formed in the fifth century; that the epigrams were published separately soon afterwards, experiencing either immediately or later the addition of non-Simonidean epigrams, some of which were consciously written in imitation (Σιμωνίδεια), others added because they were taken to be his or because they simply seemed worthy of inclusion.⁴⁷ The title, whatever it was, still named only Simonides as author. As this *sylloge* developed, it could have split like an amoeba into two or more *syllogae*,

⁴² See Gutzwiller (1998b: 37–8, with n. 75). Note that the Simonidean sequence in *AP* is followed by a Callimachean one (7.517–25) and, after one poem by Nicander, a brief sequence of poems by Theodoridas (527–9). (Planudes, by the way, completely broke up this sequence in *APL*.)

⁴³ Kaibel (1873: 451) argues that Hephaestion had access to a *sylloge* of Simonidean epigrams.

⁴⁴ Arguing for Plutarch's having made use of a *Syll.Sim.*: Boas (1905: 92–6), Bravi (2005: 2).

⁴⁵ On Aristides see above, n. 20.

⁴⁶ Although even Tzetzes cannot be ruled out. As I show in Sider (2005: 65–6), he seems to have had access to some texts on allegory that are now lost.

⁴⁷ Σιμωνιδείων ὑπ(ό)μνημα, written on a sillybos (*P.Oxy.* 2433, 2nd cent. A.D.), is taken to be the description of "a popular exposition of his famous 'Sayings'" by Pfeiffer (1968: 222, n. 6), but most of these anecdotes speak for themselves. Whatever these Σιμωνιδεία were, this label would seem to have been attached to a commentary on something more serious.

each developing slightly differently as these too were reedited. By the third century one of these was rearranged alphabetically, probably to make it easy for somebody who remembered only the beginning of an epigram to locate it within the collection. It was from at least one of these *syllogae* (not necessarily an alphabetic one) that Meleager chose for his *Garland*. The *syllogae* continued to have separate existence for an unknown time thereafter, an alphabetic one being used to add to Meleager's anthology.

As we have seen, criteria for inclusion or exclusion from the genuine works of Simonides are rarely available.

Table I
80 Epigrams in the *GA* ascribed therein or by another ancient source,
however doubtfully, to Simonides

<i>GA</i>	<i>FGE</i>	<i>GA</i>	<i>FGE</i>
5.159	60	7.431	65
5.161	* Asclepiades 40 GP	7.442	54
6.2/ <i>E</i> 49	19	7.443	47
6.50	15	7.496	68
6.52	61	7.507a	* Alexander 1 <i>FGE</i>
6.144	* Anacreon 15 <i>FGE</i>	7.507b	81
6.197	17a	7.508	* Empedocles 1 <i>FGE</i>
6.212	62	7.509	82
6.213	27	7.510	72
6.214	34	7.511	75
6.215	13	7.512	53
6.216	*	7.513	74
6.217	59	7.514	71
7.20	51	7.515	70
7.24	66	7.516	84
7.25	67	7.647	* Simias 7 GP
7.77	85	7.650b	76b
7.177	86	7.677 (s.a.n.; Hdt.)	6
7.187	* Philip 77 GP <i>Garland</i>	9.147	* Antagoras 2 GP
7.248	22a	9.700	48
7.249	22b	9.757	32a
7.250	12	9.758	33b
7.251	9	10.105	79
7.253	8	13.11	50
7.254	49	13.14	35
7.254b	78	13.19	43
7.257 (s.a.n.; schol. Aristid.)	18	13.20	64
7.258	46	13.26	36
7.270	76a	13.28	* Antigenes 1 <i>FGE</i>
7.296	45	13.30	* (92 W)
7.300	73	16.2	30
7.301	7	16.3	42
7.302	77	16.23	31
7.344	83a	16.24	25
7.344b	83b	16.26	2
7.345	* Aeschrion 1 GP	16.60	57
7.347 (s.a.n.; Fav. = Ps.-Dio Prus.)	10	16.82	68
7.348	37	16.204	36
7.349	*	16.232	5
		Σ^π/E 12	55
		Σ^π	87

* 12 epigrams not “Simonides” in *FGE*, but ascribed to Simonides either by *GA* or another ancient source.

N.B. *GA* = union of *AP*, *API*, Σ^π and *Syll. Euphemiana* (= *E*);

s.a.n. = *sine auctoris nota*.

Table II
22 Epigrams not in the *GA* ascribed to Simonides,
arranged first by “Simonides” *FGE* number

1.	Hephaestion <i>Ench.</i> 4.6	69.	Pollux 5.47
11.	Favorin. (= Ps.Dio Prus.) <i>or.</i> 37.18 = 2.21 Arnim	88.	Callistratus <i>Symmikta</i> 5 ap. Athen. 3.125c
14.	Plut. <i>Malign.Hdt.</i> 39.871a–b & Athen. 13.573c	89.	Stobaeus 1.8.22 (88 W) — Aristides 2.510 D. (146 B = 89 W, elegy?)
16.	<i>IG</i> 7.53	—	Herod. Π. Mov. Λεξ. 950.19 Lentz
19.	Plut. <i>Malign.Hdt.</i> 36, 869c	—	(165 B; epigram)
26a.	Arist. <i>rhet.</i> 1367b18	—	Athen. 656cd (171 B = 26 W, ex temp.)
28.	Plut. <i>an seni.</i> 3.785a	—	Athen. 456c (172 B; griphos/ epigram)
29.	Paus. 6.9.9	—	Athen. 456e (173 B; epigram)
41.	Eust. <i>Od.</i> 1761.25	—	Athen. 680d (174 B; epigram)
44.	Trypho Π. Τρόπων	—	Tzetzes <i>Chil.</i> 1.372 (177 B; ἄσμα)
52.	Hephaestion Π.Ποιημ. 4, p. 60 Consbr.		
63.	Diog. Laert. 4.45		

THE ARRANGEMENT OF EPIGRAMS IN COLLECTIONS

Nita Krevans

A passion for collecting is characteristic of both the Hellenistic kings and the scholars they patronized. The kings collected objects (art, books) and creatures (zoological specimens, scholars).¹ The scholars collected information, and their publications frequently took the form of encyclopedic compilations of earlier material. The most famous example of this impulse to gather and arrange information is the monumental bibliographical catalogue of Callimachus, the *Pinakes*,² but it is only one of many such treatises. Callimachus himself authored other, similar works (on winds, rivers, birds, etc.);³ his pupil Hermippus produced his own, biographically oriented *Pinakes*; Eratosthenes wrote a chronological encyclopedia; Philitas, Zenodotus and Simias collected glosses.⁴

The anthology is thus a quintessentially Hellenistic form, a textual analogy to the ultimate Hellenistic collection—the great library at Alexandria. While there are earlier precedents for these works,⁵ the dominance of the anthology in Hellenistic culture is new and significant. The first surviving author-designed poetry books (Callimachus' *Aetia* and *Iambi*) date from this period, the Hesiodic-style catalogue poem⁶ is revived by authors like Nicander and Hermesianax, and papyrus finds⁷

¹ Books: Blum (1991: 99–107); Pfeiffer (1968: 234–51); Platthy (1968: *test.* 28–35, 99, 138–153. Art: Plut. *Arat.* 12–13; Athen. 5.196e; Hansen (1971: 308–59). Zoological specimens: Fraser (1972: 2.466, n. 39).

² On the *Pinakes* (sometimes mistakenly treated as a catalogue of the Alexandrian library), see Schmidt (1922); Blum (1991).

³ On these works see most recently Krevans (2004).

⁴ Pfeiffer (1968: 89–91, 115, 129, 163–4); Bing (2003: 330, n. 1).

⁵ E.g., the *Museion* of Alcidas or the *Synagoge* of Hippias of Elis, collections of proverbs by Aristotle and Clearchus, and early epigram collections such as the alleged *sylloge* of Simonides. See Pfeiffer (1968: 50–4, 83–4); Cameron (1993: 388–93); Gutzwiller (1998b: 50–3). See also the articles by Petrovic and Sider in this volume.

⁶ An alternative, “continuous” form of anthology, in which a series of items are linked by formulaic transitions. See the further discussion of the relationship of catalogue to anthology below.

⁷ Papyri cited where possible from the bibliographic catalogue of Mertens-Pack 3 (<http://www.ulg.ac.be/facphl/services/cedopal/index.htm>), which provides complete publication history and further references for each fragment; hereafter abbreviated MP.

bear witness to a wide range of literary and sub-literary anthologies—excerpts from drama, gnomic treasuries, themed collections of verse.⁸ Many of these compilations appear to be the work of ordinary readers assembling a group of favorite selections; they offer compelling evidence for a general fascination with collecting and excerpting extending far beyond the precincts of the Museum in Alexandria.⁹

Epigram anthologies were especially popular,¹⁰ and surviving examples on papyrus, although fragmentary, reveal that such collections varied widely in purpose and tone.¹¹ One third-century text appears to be more a documentary record than an anthology; it contains copies of epitaphs by an anonymous poet commissioned for inscription.¹² From the same period, by contrast, comes a papyrus entitled “mixed epigrams” which opens with a lengthy elegiac epithalamium for Queen Arsinoe (I or II) that bears little resemblance to traditional sympotic or inscribed epigram.¹³ A second-century fragment with six votive and funerary quatrains by Mnasalces maintains a thematic focus on the inscribed nature of the form but emphasizes the literary aspect of the poetry by assembling poems of equal length by a single author.¹⁴ Another second-century example written on the back of a set of accounts offers an anthology within an anthology: after a series of excerpts from dramatic texts, the compiler presents two epigrams by Posidippus. They are set off by a heading and divided from each other by the word ΑΛΛΟ (indicating a second poem by the same author).¹⁵

⁸ MP 1568, 1571, 1576, 1579, 1580 (drama); 1569, 1584, 1613 (gnomes); 1573 (verses on the theme of women) and 1574 (excerpts on the theme of Fortune).

⁹ On the popularity of anthologies during this period see further Roberts (1953: 271–2); on the production of such collections by teachers and students see Criboire (1996: 47–9, 150). She categorizes many of the papyrus anthologies as school texts (e.g. the gnomic anthology listed in the previous note, MP 1584).

¹⁰ Of eighteen verse anthologies in MP dated earlier than A.D. 100, ten are epigram anthologies.

¹¹ More detailed discussion of these and other early epigram anthologies on papyrus in Gutzwiller (1998b: 20–36).

¹² MP 1761 = P. Cair. Zen 59532 = *SH* 977, epitaphs for the tombstone of a dog.

¹³ MP 1593 = P. Petrie II.49a = P.Lit. Lond.60 = *SH* 961. Beneath the title ΣΥΜΜΕΙΚΤΑ ΕΠΙΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ (written on the verso of the roll) is the name Posidippus, but it remains uncertain whether other author names followed or whether all the poems were by one author. See Gutzwiller (1998b: 25), Lloyd-Jones and Parsons (1983: 464–5), Bruss (2005b: 7–8).

¹⁴ MP 1324.25 = P. Koln 5.204; see the discussion in Gutzwiller (1998b: 31).

¹⁵ MP 1435 = P. Firmin-Didot = GP 11–12. The amateur scribe, following the convention of using the *incipit* as a title, took the first four words and centered them as a heading for his sub-collection but then omitted those words from the first line of the

Further evidence for epigram collections is provided by *incipit*-lists—lists of epigrams consisting of the opening words of each poem, with the phrases (or entire first lines) functioning as titles.¹⁶ Several early examples survive,¹⁷ and in at least one case (P. Vindob. G 40611) the purpose of the list is explicitly stated: the papyrus is headed τὰ ἐπιζητούμενα τῶν ἐπιγραμμάτων ἐν τῇ ᾧ βύβλῳ, “Items sought from the epigrams in the first book.”¹⁸ Later headings preserved in the papyrus refer to a second and a fourth book. This list thus provides evidence for at least two early epigram-collections: the source of the list (clearly a substantial and professionally produced work, divided into numbered books), and the eventual new compendium to be produced by assembling the selected poems.

Finally, ancient commentators also confirm the existence of formally produced editions of the Hellenistic epigrammatists. There are numerous references to generically labeled epigram collections (e.g. *Epigrammata* of Callimachus and Posidippus).¹⁹ We also hear of a metaphorically titled work, the *Soros*, or “heap.” It remains unclear whether the *Soros* was a true anthology, containing works by several different poets, or whether it contained only poems by the one author definitively named in connection with the title, Posidippus.²⁰ The title’s English translation

poem. A later scribe, evidently feeling that centering was not sufficient to allow these words to do double duty as both title and text, added the words ΠΟΣΕΙΔΕΙΔΕΙΠΠΟΥ (sic) ΕΠΙΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ (“Epigrams of Posidippus”) to serve as a new title. See Gutzwiller (1998b: 22), Turner (1987: no. 45), Thompson (1987), Obbink (2004a: 16–28). The use of centered author-headings to distinguish items in anthologies is common. Compare MP 1568 = P. Berol. 9772 and MP 1961 = P. Heid. Siegm. 187.

¹⁶ A common use for the *incipit* in antiquity; see above note and Blum (1991: 157).

¹⁷ P. Vindob. G 40611 (unpublished) is a third-century B.C. list of nearly 250 incipits, including at least one poem by Asclepiades; preliminary description by Harrauer (1981). An ostrakon from the second century B.C. has near-duplicate copies on each side of seven *incipits*, including the first lines of two poems of Leonidas (*Ostr.* 1488 = MP 1596 = *SH* 976). Cribiore (1996: no. 243) believes this is a school exercise. See also Sider (1997: 203–25) for a discussion of the later P. Oxy 3724 = MP 1596.21, 2410.11 (I A.D.), containing 175 incipits linked to the poet Philodemus.

¹⁸ Harrauer (1981: 50).

¹⁹ Fr. 393–402 Pf., with citations to “the *Epigrammata* of Callimachus” from Diogenes Laertius, Athenaeus, Hephaestion and others. See Pfeiffer (1949–1953: 2.xcii); for Posidippus (collection cited by Aristarchus and Athenaeus) see Gow-Page (1965: 2.483); Posidippus 14 and 16 GP (= 120 and 121 AB), and note 20 below. But see the cautionary discussion of the range for the term *epigrammata* in the Hellenistic period at Bruss (2005b: 6–10).

²⁰ The *Soros* is linked to the poet Posidippus by Aristarchus (Schol. A ad A101, which contrasts a reading in the poet’s *Epigrams* with one in the *Soros*). Reitzenstein (1893: 100) proposed that the *Soros* included works by several different poets—in particular,

suggests a miscellany, but that need not rule out a miscellany by a single author, and the connotations of the word *Soros* in Greek can lead us either to an impression of careless aggregation (a disordered heap) or of polished, selected material (the programmatic *Idyll* 7 of Theocritus closes with a description of a heap of winnowed grain and uses the word *soros*).²¹

In one sense, then, anthologies of epigrams can be seen as a manifestation of a larger intellectual trend, an impulse to gather small pieces of text together and preserve them in book form. Collections of poems (lyric, epigram, and shorter elegies) differ from many other contemporary anthologies, however, in an important respect: these shorter poems need not be dismembered into excerpt-sized bits to fit into the collection, but are typically inserted in their entirety. A five-line citation from a tragedy copied into a collection of passages about fate is obviously a very different sort of text from the entire play; by contrast, the poem in a collection is still a poem—there is no apparent distinction between its original size and integrity and its new identity in the anthology. This equation of “poem” and “anthologized poem” is a false one, however. A poem circulating separately (whether in performance or as text) may have strikingly different resonances than the same poem as part of a collection.²² This is especially true in the case of votive and sepulchral epigrams, whose original context (fictional or real) included both an inscriptional surface (gravestone, statue, tablet) and a specific topographical or architectural setting (burial ground, agora, temple). Whether actual or presumed, this inscriptional context is a “whole” from which the epigram has been removed to be set into the book.²³

In addressing the issue of the arrangement of epigrams in Hellenistic collections, then, we face two different sets of questions. First, what is

Posidippus, Asclepiades and Hedyllus. Others argue that the collection is an earlier work of Posidippus. See the extended discussion in Cameron (1993: 369–76), with further references.

²¹ Cameron (1993: 375); Gutzwiller (1997b: 155–6); Lasserre (1959: 222); cf. Gow (1965: 2.169).

²² Krevans (1984: 9–27). The *Coma Berenices* of Callimachus (fr. 110 Pf.) is an example of a poem which circulated both individually and as part of a collection, most likely in two slightly different versions. See Pfeiffer (1949–1953: 1.123, 2.xxxvi).

²³ The importance of the tombstone and its location for funerary epitaph, even in the case of fictional examples, has been explored by Bing (1988b: 39–40, 69–70) and by Bruss (2005b: 10–11, 38–87). More generally on monumental texts versus texts on papyrus see Bing (1998: 21–43, esp. 29–40).

the *physical* arrangement of the poems in the bookroll? What sort of information does the layout of an early epigram anthology provide for the reader; what new visual setting does that layout provide for the (formerly) inscribed poem? Second, what is the editorial arrangement of the poems within the collection? What sorts of principles are used to select and order the poems? The two sets of questions are intertwined, not only because the editorial work of ordering poems within a collection depends on reliable scribal conventions for recording and transmitting the editor's decisions but also because the visual setting of the poems affects the reader's perception of the relationship between epigram and book.

The visual presentation of the text in an ancient epigram anthology is fairly consistent throughout the Hellenistic period.²⁴ The text is written out in columns across the width of the roll, from left to right, in continuous capital letters (no punctuation, no word division). Top and bottom margins vary in size, as do the intercolumnar spaces; in general, margins are far smaller than those in a modern literary hardcover. Although lyric verse is often written out as prose in the early period, scribes do begin a new line on the papyrus for each new line of stichic verse;²⁵ the length of an epigram's metrical unit (e.g., hexameter and pentameter) therefore defines the width of each column relative to the letter-size chosen by the scribe. There is no blank space to mark the division between epigrams. Instead, there is an unobtrusive dash (a *paragraphos*) beneath the first few letters of the last line of each poem. The dash is not normally even allowed to protrude into the margin to increase its visibility.²⁶ Pentameter lines in elegy are rarely set off by indentation; the couplet-based elegiac meter thus has the same general appearance

²⁴ See the study of Johnson (2004) for a survey of the formatting and scribal practices found in the Oxyrhynchus papyri across literary genres; condensed, with application to epigram, at Johnson (2005: 70–2).

²⁵ This is the normal practice for all stichic meters in early papyri, although there are a few exceptions—the third-century B.C. MP 2460 (= P. Heid. 176) has hexameters written out as prose but marks the verse-endings with a colon (:). Lyric verse, on the other hand, is frequently written out in early examples with no regard for colometry. See Turner (1987: 12). By contrast, as Peter Bing reminds me, verse inscribed on stone, while frequently adhering to the same conventions, is less likely to observe strict coincidence of verse-end and line-end and more likely to be influenced by the shape and size of the stone surface in choice of layout.

²⁶ The *paragraphos* is also used to mark change of speaker in drama and to separate sections of longer works. See Turner (1987: 8, 12–13).

on the papyrus roll as stichic poetry like hexameter or iambic trimeter.²⁷ The only interruption in this solid block of text occurs when centered or outset headings intervene between groups of poems—typically to announce a change of author (in multi-author collections) or designate a new thematic grouping.²⁸ These headings, so sharply distinguished from the uniform, compact mass of the epigrams, are thus marked visually as editorial rather than authorial text. Their presence calls attention to the process that brought this epigram to its present place in the anthology, either by emphasizing a principle of selection (thematic headings) or by recalling the original source of the text (author attribution). By the same token, the unbroken mass of text within each group of poems promotes the unity of the group and suppresses the separate identity of the individual epigrams. The contrast with the original, inscribed environment is stark: from a shaped, framed and separate existence in a ritually bounded space (burial ground or sacred precinct) the poem becomes a barely acknowledged subdivision in a featureless column of identically shaped rows of letters. The role of the reader changes dramatically as well. In inscribed poems, the reader is often forced to become a player in an epigrammatic drama—the numerous funerary epigrams which invoke the “passer-by” as an auditor or even speaker are an obvious example, but even in the case where the inscribed object merely speaks in the first person, the reader is directed to enter a fictional world in which statues speak and the dead are reanimated by their own tombstones. The reader becomes a character in the play whose set and stage directions are provided by the inscribed object. The blocks of epigram inked onto papyrus, by contrast, invite the reader to become not a character, but an editor. The task of recognizing and acknowledging the divisions between words, between clauses, and (most significantly, from our point of view) between poems must be performed as part of the act of reading. Adjacent poems on similar subjects, for example, depend on the editorial acumen of the reader to avert careless conflation of two originally distinct items.²⁹

²⁷ An exception is MP 1756, but compare MP 1435 and 1761. The variation in length between hexameter and pentameter is often visible in the right-hand margin of the column, but since hexameters themselves also vary, the lack of *eisthesis* for the pentameter makes it difficult at first glance to distinguish elegy and hexameter in these early bookrolls.

²⁸ E.g., MP 1761, 1435, and (most recently) the Milan papyrus (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309 = MP 1435.01), on which see further below.

²⁹ On the other hand, a poet-editor might exploit the inconspicuous *paragraphoi* precisely so as to elicit from the reader a careful conflation of two ostensibly distinct

The difference between a modern edition and the typical Hellenistic format is schematized below using Austin's translation of three adjoining epigrams from the Milan papyrus (AB 99–101; supplements noted only in the modern format):

Epigrams from the P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309, original format

THECRETANASCLASBEINGDEAFANDUNABLETOHEAR
 THESURGEONTHESHOREORTHEROAROFTHIEWINDS
 ALLOFASUDDENAFTERPRAYINGTOASCLEPIUSRETURNEDHOME
 ABLETOPICKUPWORDSEVENTHROUGHABRICKWALL
 WHENZENOWASABOUTTOENJOYAPEACEFULSLEEP
 AFTERBEINGBLINDFORTWENTYFIVEYEARS
 HERECOVEREDHISIGHTATTHEAGEOFEIGHTYBUTAFTERGLIMPING
 THESUNTWICEONLYHESAWGRIEVOUSHADES
 THEPERFECTMANASCLEPIUSASKSFORMODERATEWEALTH
 ANDYOUHAVEAMPLEPOWERTOGRANTITIFYOUWISH
 ANDHEASKSFORHEALTHTWO REMEDIESFOR THESEAPPEARTOBE
 THEHIGHCITADELOFMORALS

Modern format

The Cretan Asclas being deaf and unable to hear
 the surge on the shore or the roar of the winds,
 all of a sudden, after praying to Asclepius, returned home
 able to pick up words even through a brick-wall.

When Zeno was about to enjoy a peaceful sleep
 after being blind for twenty-five years,
 he recovered his sight at the age of eighty, but [after glimpsing]
 the sun twice only, he saw grievous Hades.

The perfect man, Asclepius, asks for moderate wealth
 —and you have ample power to grant it if you wish—
 and he asks for health, two remedies. For these appear to be
 the high citadel of morals.

items, i.e. he might tap ambiguities of format so as to invite readers to ponder whether adjacent poems in fact belong together, constituting an aesthetic unity. Thus for instance in the Posidippus epigrams 100–1 AB (cited below), the unobtrusive division between poems may encourage the reader to view the suggested prayer for moderate health in 101 AB as an extension of, and moral reflection on, 100 AB with its miraculous yet futile cure. Similarly, a reader may justifiably wonder how strongly to mark the boundary (if at all) between the penultimate poem of the *Lithika* (19 AB) and the prayer closing the section (20 AB). On the relationship between reader and inscribed object see, e.g., Walsh (1991); Meyer (1993); Bing (2002); Bruss (2002–3).

The editor of a Hellenistic anthology, then, begins with the knowledge that the conventions of the literary bookroll will work to dissolve the boundaries between epigrams (authorial division) while simultaneously promoting the new, artificial boundaries (editorial division) created by titles and headings. With this in mind, let us consider the possible strategies for arranging poems within the collection. Such an examination must take into account not only those decisions which unify the poems (thematic and verbal linkages, ring composition, etc.), but also those decisions which encourage readers to see the poems as individual units. The latter are frequently ignored in studies of poetic collections, which tend to focus on symmetries and correspondences, but in the face of the emphasis on unification created by the format of the bookroll, they are of considerable importance as a balancing mechanism.

The editor of any given collection may choose to weight his decisions in one direction or the other; that is, towards unity (*concordia*) or towards individuation (*variatio*,³⁰ or, in Greek, *ποικιλία*). This is true even—or perhaps especially—in author-designed collections, where the poet plays the role of both author and editor, and can shape his book to foreground either the individual poems or the assemblage. The poet may even create poems solely for specific places in the collection, e.g., opening or concluding poems. By creating new “editorial” poems, and by adhering to certain principles of arrangement, the poet-editor is able to construct collections with very different effects. At one extreme, as in Virgil’s *Eclogues*, the poems are merged almost completely; theme, meter and author are identical.³¹ The first two books of Callimachus’ *Aetia*, with their narrative frame and common theme, conform to this “unified” type.³² Indeed, *Aetia* I–II verge on catalogue-poetry, and other examples of this subgenre (e.g., Hermesianax’s *Leontion*) might profitably be viewed as a form of anthology, where items are bound together in a patently artificial narrative frame. In epigram anthologies, the presence of extended series of poems on a single theme would function in this same manner. In some cases framed, symmetrical sequences of

³⁰ Not to be confused with “variation,” a modern term denoting the tendency of Hellenistic epigram to play on earlier epigrams. See, e.g., Giangrande (1973b), Tarán (1979). On the ancient term for this sort of variation (*aemulatio/zêlôsis*) see Reiff (1959).

³¹ Krevans (1984: 10–11, 327–50). Studies of the structure of the *Eclogues* have identified numerous symmetrical patterns in the book; see, e.g., Skutsch (1969), Van Sickle (1978).

³² Krevans (1984: 254, 291); on the various theories about the composition of *Aetia* I–II and III–IV see the useful summary in Massimilla (1996: 29–40).

poems take on the character of miniature books-within-the-book.³³

At the other extreme are those collections which take pains to distinguish the individual poems. An obvious example is Horace's *Odes*, which opens with a notorious display of *variatio*, the so-called "Parade Odes," nine consecutive poems in different meters on different themes.³⁴ Callimachus' *Iambi*, while not as diverse as the *Odes*, still leans heavily towards differentiation.³⁵ Early studies of Roman poetic collections emphasized this principle,³⁶ but in fact *variatio* is often employed simultaneously with *concordia*. The opening sequence in Meleager's book of amatory epigrams, as reconstructed by Gutzwiller, contains seven poems on the theme of wine—but the first five poems are by five different authors.³⁷ Other possible devices to introduce *variatio* include alternations in poem length, in meter (not all epigrams are elegiac), or in dialect. Editorial strategies can therefore counteract the book's unifying influence by reemphasizing the boundaries between poems.

It would not be too much of an exaggeration to characterize both of the strategies outlined above as weapons in a competition between editor and author for control of the text. The editor, after all, has a vested interest in his product—the book—while the author has a vested interest in the original poem. (This is true even in cases when the author and the editor are the same person, that is, for author-designed poetry collections such as those of Callimachus, Virgil, and Horace.) In this sense *any* sort of systematic pattern of arrangement—whether it emphasizes *variatio* or *concordia*—calls attention to the role of the editor and inserts him as an artistic rival to the poet. We must therefore acknowledge a third possible strategy, *utilitas*. By organizing a collection in ways which make it as easy as possible for the reader to find an individual poem, the editor can declare himself an ally of the poet. An obvious example would be alphabetical organization;³⁸ less obvious but also effective are labeled subdivisions which direct readers to specific portions of the

³³ See, e.g., Gutzwiller (1998b: 282–301).

³⁴ On the first nine odes see Seidensticker (1976), Santirocco (1986: 41–46). On the structure of the *Odes* more generally see, e.g., Port (1925–6: 299–304), Krevans (1984: 351–81), Santirocco (1986), Porter (1987), Hutchinson (2002b).

³⁵ Krevans (1984: 290–2); For varying analyses of the structure of the *Iambi* see Dawson (1950: 138–43), Clayman (1980: 48–54), (1988: 277–86); Kerkhecker (1999: 282–90), Acosta-Hughes (2002: 5–9).

³⁶ On which, e.g., Kroll (1924: 225–40).

³⁷ Gutzwiller (1997b: 172).

³⁸ Standard for reference works such as booklists (e.g. the *Pinakes*) in this period; see Blum (1991: 146, 209–10, 226–7); Regenbogen (1950: 1427–8). On alphabetical ordering of poems in Alexandrian editions see Cameron (1993: 39).

roll. While both devices call attention to the editor's presence, they characterize that presence as bibliographic rather than poetic.

The two most famous and influential early epigram anthologies—those of Meleager and Philip—offer an informative contrast in editorial choices. While the collections themselves are now lost, subsumed into the later *AP* and *APL*, reconstructed sequences from both works allow some discussion of the organizational preferences of each anthologist.³⁹ At first glance, the two works seem to follow very different paths. Meleager's *Garland* is an elaborately designed work divided thematically into four books, each featuring interlocking series of poems. Many sequences are framed and organized into symmetrical arrays; moreover, Meleager introduces the collection with a lengthy opening poem about the unity of his collection: the epigrams of the anthologized poets are flowers, while Meleager himself is the weaver of a garland (Meleager 1 GP = *AP* 4.1). He then completes the frame for his collection with a concluding poem spoken in the voice of the *coronis*, an editorial symbol used to mark the end of major sections of a bookroll (129 GP = *AP* 12.257). The overlapping roles of poet and editor are aptly figured in this final epigram, which makes a marginal sign not only the subject of verse but even the speaker of verse.⁴⁰

Philip's collection, on the other hand, is organized alphabetically by the first letter of the first word of each poem. While he does open the collection with a brief "garland" poem in imitation of Meleager (Philip 1 GP *Garland* = *AP* 4.2), his editorial persona constrains his poetic persona to begin the poem with the word ἄνθεα, "flowers," so that his opening poem can take its place at the head of the collection with the alpha-group.⁴¹ We could therefore characterize Philip as an aggressive proponent of *utilitas*, but that would ignore the evidence that once the poems were grouped by first letter, arrangement within each letter-group followed principles similar to those of Meleager. Like Meleager, for example, Philip is fond of juxtaposing his own epigrams with their models. In some cases the epigrammatic practice of opening the imitation with wording reminiscent of the original ensures that he will be able to place the two poems in adjacent positions; in other

³⁹ See Cameron (1993: 19–33 369–76), Gutzwiller (1998b: 18–9, 155, 276–322), and Argentieri in this volume.

⁴⁰ See Van Sickle (1981); Bing (1988b: 33–5).

⁴¹ Cameron (1993: 38); on the relationship to his Meleagrian model see Gow-Page (1968: 2.329–30).

cases a clever word choice provides the placement. Thus, as Cameron notes, “the reader is constantly made aware of the ingenuity of the combined alphabetical and thematic link.”⁴² The Philippan epigrams, inserted next to predecessors by an editorial device, thereby serve a double function as both poetry and commentary.

The publication of the Milan epigram papyrus in 2001⁴³ permits us now to examine an ancient epigram collection in its original form.⁴⁴ We can see not only the sequence of poems, but also the actual indications for poem and section divisions and “read” the collection as an ancient reader would have done. We can also be certain that the arrangement of the poems is that of a Hellenistic editor. There has therefore been considerable scholarly interest in the structure of the book. My own view is that the collection is primarily organized with a view to *utilitas*; others, however, have found many examples of aesthetically pleasing pairs or sequences of poems.⁴⁵

Let us begin by considering the papyrus and its layout.⁴⁶ The roll is formed from sheets of papyrus approximately eight inches high and seven and a half inches wide glued together. The surviving portion of the roll is about five feet long, but the end of the book is missing.⁴⁷ Given what we know about the length of other ancient poetry books, several hundred lines may be lost; that is, several more feet of papyrus. The poems are written in narrow columns across the width of the roll. Centered headings break the roll into sections; within each section poems are divided from each other only by *paragraphoi*. In other words, the roll follows all the typical conventions for a Hellenistic anthology described earlier in this essay.

The roll does have several slightly unusual features. One is the presence of marginal notes in a second hand. Someone—it is not clear who,

⁴² Cameron (1993: 41).

⁴³ See above, n. 28. Publication data: Bastianini, Gallazzi and Austin (2001); *editio minor*, Austin and Bastianini (2002).

⁴⁴ An opportunity eagerly seized by numerous scholars; bibliographic entries for Posidippus exceeded 100 items for the years 2004–2005; see Martine Cuypers, *A Hellenistic Bibliography* s.v. Posidippus, <http://www.gltc.leidenuniv.nl/index.php3?m=184&c=151>.

⁴⁵ My own views have been argued in Krevans (2004) but see also e.g. Gutzwiller (2005b), Fantuzzi (2004), Baumbach and Trampedach (2004), Hunter (2004), Bing (2004), Sens (2005a).

⁴⁶ On this subject see further Johnson (2005), Krevans (2005: 82), Bastianini, Gallazzi and Austin (2001: 1.13–6).

⁴⁷ Some of the beginning may be missing as well; see Johnson (2005: 74–7).

or how soon after the roll was produced—went through the roll placing the abbreviated word τοῦτο (“this one”) next to certain epigrams, probably to select them for copying into yet a different collection.⁴⁸ Another significant feature is a negative one: the absence of author-headings in this papyrus makes it extremely probable that the entire collection is by Posidippus, since two of the poems (15 and 65 AB) were already known to us from other sources and firmly ascribed to him.⁴⁹

As noted above, however, the papyrus does have headings of another sort. The collection is organized by topic, and each set of poems is prefaced by a centered title. Some titles are poorly preserved (marked by asterisks below), but the editors of the first edition have restored the following sequence:

- Lithika** (On Stones): poems 1–20 (126 lines)
- Oionoskopika* (On Bird-Signs, or, On Divination): poems 21–35 (80 lines)
- Anathematika* (On Dedications): poems 36–41 (38 lines)
- Epitymbia** (Funerary poems): poems 42–61 (116 lines)
- Andriantopoiika* (On Sculptors): poems 62–70 (50 lines)
- Hippika* (On Horses): poems 71–88 (98 lines)
- Nauagika* (On Shipwrecks): poems 89–94 (26 lines)
- Iamatika* (On Cures): poems 95–101 (32 lines)
- Tropoi* (?On Characters?): poems 102–9 (32 lines)

The *Tropoi* were followed by a new section, but the title is lost and the papyrus breaks off after traces of four more poems.

Note that the sections vary markedly in length. The gemstone section, at 126 lines, is as long as four of the smallest sections combined. They also vary in scope. “Funerary poems” is a broad category, including poems about both men and women, both tragic deaths and peaceful ones. Yet the shipwreck poems, a very narrow category, could have been included in the funerary section, as they apparently were by Meleager, to tell from their inclusion in Meleagrian sequences in *AP* 7 (271–3, for example);⁵⁰ from what we can see of the *Tropoi* they, too, are funerary. By the same token, epigrams in the highly specific sections on cures and horses either imply or openly describe a thank offering to the gods for the gift of health or victory, and could have been included in the

⁴⁸ 40, 69, 70, 72, 73, 77, 86, and 112 AB. We can see here the beginning of a process that might lead to an incipit-list like that in the unpublished Vienna papyrus; see above, n. 17. There are also occasional stichometric notes giving line-counts for each section; see Johnson (2005: 77).

⁴⁹ On author-headings see above, n. 15.

⁵⁰ See further Bruss (2005b: 110, 113, 124, 148, 161–2, and 164).

dedication section. Later epigram collections such as the *AP* contain only the broader categories: *Anathematika* (*AP* 6) *Epitymbia* (*AP* 7).

Another odd feature of the thematically organized sections in this papyrus is their adherence to the subject-matter of inscribed epigram. Three sections are concerned with gravestones. Three are concerned with dedications. Most of the gemstones are incised, an activity which is the pictorial equivalent of inscription. It is true that several of the gemstone poems might well be considered erotic (especially the poems describing jewels given as gifts to lovely girls, 4–7 AB), but by defining them as belonging to a group of poems on stones, the editor has highlighted the stone and suppressed the girl. Similarly, although the section on sculptors focuses on describing and criticizing artistic technique (a subject popular with other Hellenistic epigrammatists), the link to inscription is still present, since statues were normally erected on inscribed bases.

Where are the sympotic epigrams, the poems on love and wine for which the “old” Posidippus was known?⁵¹ Since the papyrus is incomplete, it is possible that the missing portion contained sections with erotic themes. A suggestive phrase appears in the last, very fragmentary, portion of the papyrus: εἶαρος ἢ Ζεφ[υρ]... (110.1 AB, “Of/in spring the Zephyr[?]”). Spring is the season of love, and Zephyrus, with his sweet breath, is often invoked when the poet falls victim to Eros. It is also possible (but less likely) that lost poems preceded the opening section; the front of the papyrus was damaged and repaired at some point.⁵² As we have it, however, the collection seems peculiarly weighted towards one side of the epigram tradition. There is thus an ironic contrast between the fictional, inscriptional settings of these poems on tombstones and statues and their cramped new quarters in this bookroll; the stone-poems have been “rewritten” onto papyrus as the editorial process transmuted them from single texts to pieces of a larger unit.

The editor, of course, not only divided the poems into labeled sections but arranged them within those sections. The most carefully designed section in the Posidippus papyrus is, appropriately, the section

⁵¹ The contrast between Posidippus in the *GA* and Posidippus elsewhere is stark; the *GA* selections (123–40 AB) are overwhelmingly erotic, while the poems preserved on papyrus or cited in authors like Athenaeus are overwhelmingly inscriptional (votive or funerary) or courtly. See further Krevans (2005: 83–6).

⁵² Johnson (2005: 74–77).

on his fellow artists—the sculptors.⁵³ It is framed by two poems about Lysippus, Alexander's official portrait sculptor (62, 70 AB); both poems apparently compare Lysippus favorably to the famous Polycleitus. Within this frame, the poems are organized in groups by length: two longer poems open the section—62 on Lysippus and 63 on the statue of Philitas. Philitas is a poetic model for Posidippus, just as Lysippus should be the model for the sculptors; both represent a Hellenistic program of craftsmanship and exactitude. Three four-line poems follow, all stressing the Hellenistic preference for realism in art—realism so great that it deceives the viewer (64–6 AB). Again Lysippus is featured in the central poem in this group. The next pair, two six-line poems, emphasizes size: miniature (67 AB) versus colossal (68 AB). The last two poems, four lines each, are fragmentary, but seem to juxtapose Myron, a fifth-century sculptor famed for his realism, with Lysippus. This juxtaposition also appeared in two of the trio of poems on realism (65, 66 AB). Meanwhile, the subjects of these two final poems, Tydeus and Alexander, echo the earlier pairing of epic hero/Alexander found in that same trio (64 and 65 AB).

The sculpture section is in my view the only section displaying this type of elaborate and conscious symmetry,⁵⁴ and it is possible that this group of poems represents a sequence designed originally by Posidippus. The remaining sections appear to be organized at least in part simply with an eye to keeping similar poems together. For example, two poems about the same gem are adjacent in the *Lithika* (6, 7 AB); two poems about bad omens for soldiers in the omens section (32, 33 AB); *Epitymbia* contains two adjacent poems about women who die in childbirth (56, 57 AB) and three funerary poems for men (59–61 AB; the rest of the section is about women); five poems in *Hippika* concern Berenice's equestrian victories (78–82 AB); the medical section contains two poems about cures after six years of illness (97, 98 AB).

Poems which fit well under each heading are usually at the beginning of the section. The stone-poems, for example, begin with a long series of epigrams about beautiful, worked stones. Only towards the end of the section do other types of stone appear: magnets (17 AB), objects

⁵³ On the arrangement of the sculpture poems see also Gutzwiller (2002), Sens (2005a).

⁵⁴ *pace* Gutzwiller (2005b).

made of stone (18 AB), unworked, giant stones cast ashore by Poseidon, god of the sea (19 AB). The section ends with a prayer to this same god (20 AB). Prayers are a traditional closing device in Greek poetry,⁵⁵ and this epigram is therefore well placed from an artistic point of view. But since the epigram does not mention stones at all, this decision also conforms to the editor's organizational preference for deferring thematically problematic items until the end of the section. A similar sequence is found in the cures section: five poems about cures (95–99 AB); then a poem about a man who is cured of blindness—but dies immediately (100 AB); finally, a prayer to Asclepius, god of healing, which does not make any reference to cures (101 AB).

Closing prayers appear only in those two sections, but other sections also display the pattern of postponing odd items until the end. The last two poems in the omen section are not about portents or omens, but about men who were famous diviners (34, 35 AB); the last three poems in the *Epitymbia* are the only poems in that section devoted exclusively to men (59–61 AB); the dedicatory section opens with four epigrams about offerings to the deified Arsinoe (36–39 AB) and then (apparently, the last poem is barely legible) ends with dedications to other divinities (40, 41 AB).

There appear to be traces of two different types of editorial arrangement in this collection, then. The sculpture section resembles other author-designed collections known from antiquity. Its symmetries are obvious, and poems on similar topics are separated to create frames (62, 70 AB) or triptychs (64–66 AB). While the remaining sections include many poems positioned in suggestive ways (as in the concluding prayers to Poseidon and Asclepius), their principal concern is to keep like with like, a concern also reflected in the decision to separate the poems thematically into titled sections, some of which are surprisingly specific. This editor, in other words, prefers *utilitas*.

One final observation about arrangement is worth making, although it is somewhat speculative. If the beginning of the papyrus is indeed the beginning of the collection, then this epigram book opened with two subjects which appear very unusual to modern scholars: stones and omens. There are other Hellenistic epigrams on precious stones—but

⁵⁵ Gutzwiller (2005b: 304) compares this prayer to the close of Bacchylides 5; see also Theocr. 7.155–7, Callim. fr. 7.13–4, 112.

they are, in relative terms, as rare as the gems they describe.⁵⁶ There are even fewer epigrams about omens. Both topics were treated in contemporary prose works, but the main themes of third-century epigram, so far as could be discerned from the poems preserved in the *GA*, were love and burial. Now we have a significant new group of epigrams—and they do not resemble the epigrams from the same period (and even from Posidippus himself) transmitted in the *GA*.

There are two possible explanations for this discrepancy. One is that the *GA* reflects the particular preferences of one or two later editors (notably Meleager, who lived more than a century after Posidippus). The other possibility is that the editor of P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309 was the one with unusual preferences, and chose to emphasize the odder features of his anthology by placing them prominently at the head of his book.

The Milan papyrus thus offers us a useful warning about the idiosyncratic nature of the editorial process. While the format of the papyrus—and even its organization into thematic sections—is normal by the standards of other ancient collections, its contents are markedly different from the epigram anthologies of the later manuscript tradition. The strong emphasis on inscribed epigram, in particular, reveals how dramatically the principles for choosing items to include in a collection can affect our view of an author: the Posidippus of the *GA* and the Posidippus of the Milan papyrus look like two different poets. Selection, as well as arrangement, is an editorial prerogative, and in the long run, it is the most influential weapon in the editor's arsenal.

⁵⁶ Most appear in the "epideictic" Book 9 of the *GA*; e.g. *AP* 9.544, 746, 747, 750, 752. On this last, a poem about a protective amethyst ring of Cleopatra (amethyst reputedly prevented drunkenness), see Gutzwiller (1995).

MELEAGER AND PHILIP AS EPIGRAM COLLECTORS

Lorenzo Argentieri

1. *The Epigram Crisis in the Second Century B.C.*

Meleager is our source of knowledge for the most important period of Greek epigram. As both poet and editor, he created an anthology called the *Garland* (Στέφανος) at the beginning of the first century B.C., comprising many epigrams by older poets, to which he added his own. Meleager's decision to form such a collection represents a major departure from earlier Hellenistic practice, which had been satisfied with merely gathering together and cataloguing the works of past authors.¹

A glance at the poets named by Meleager in the opening poem of the *Garland* (*AP* 4.1 = 1 GP) reveals a rather uneven chronological distribution. Here they are ranked by date of birth:²

Up to 350 B.C.	Archilochus, Sappho, Anacreon, Simonides, Bacchylides, Plato, Erinna
ca. 330–320	Anyte, Nossis, Moero, Leonidas, Asclepiades, Simias, Perses (?)
ca. 310–300	Posidippus, Hedyllus, Alexander Aetolus, Nicias, Callimachus, Aratus, Antagoras
ca. 270	Euphorion, Rhianus, Hegesippus (?)
ca. 250	Nicaenetus, Damagetus, Mnasalces, Dioscorides, Theodoridas, Phaedimus (?)
ca. 230–220	Samius, Alcaeus
ca. 180	Antipater, Phanias, Polystratos

It is remarkable that after including many poets of the third century B.C., he has only three from the second. This difference may be due to Meleager's personal taste; he preferred third-century authors (rightly, to

¹ Argentieri (1998: 2–4).

² Revised from Page (1975: xi) and the introductions to individual poets in Gow-Page (1965). I do not deal with the thorny problem of epigrams ascribed to ancient authors ("up to 350"), which however Meleager held for genuine; see the introductions in Gow-Page (1965) to Sappho and Erinna, and Page (1980) for all the others, along with Sider in this volume.

judge from the extant epigrams). It may also be that among the poets whose chronology is uncertain³ many belong to second century B.C. The same may be true for the poets not mentioned in the proem but who surely entered the collection, as evident in extant sections of the *Garland*.⁴ But even so, it seems undeniable that in the second century fewer epigrams were written and of lower quality.

Epigram was brought to its height by two generations of poets born between 330 and 300 B.C., the earlier, that of Anyte, Nossis, Leonidas and Asclepiades; and the latter, that of Theocritus, Hedylus, Posidippus and above all Callimachus. Already for mid-third century poets like Mnasilces, Theodoridas, Damagetus and Dioscorides, traditional themes had gone stale; the last wave of novelty came with Alcaeus of Messene (born ca. 230) in his use of a quite unusual topic for epigrams, politics.

In the second half of the second century the genre seems to continue its decline. We have only two poets whose oeuvre is sizable enough to give us an overall idea, Antipater of Sidon (ca. 180/70–100 B.C.) and Phanias.⁵ Antipater imitates older poets (mainly Leonidas) to varying degrees in at least 36 of 86 epigrams, and even writes multiple variations on the same theme,⁶ thereby pushing the limits of monotony. Phanias is not very different: 4 of the 7 catalogue offerings, again much in the manner of Leonidas, and one takes up the very common *topos* of body hair putting an end to a boy's beauty.⁷

³ Chaeremon, Hermodorus, Phaennus, Pancrates, Pamphilus, Tymnes; add Parthenides, Polyclitus, Melanippides, Euphemus (mentioned by Meleager but with no surviving epigram), and Diotimus and Menecrates, names which cover several persons.

⁴ Among the poets not named in the proem we can date Phalaecus (born ca. 330 B.C.), Heraclitus and Theaetetus (friends of Callimachus) and the philosopher Zenodotus (born ca. 180 B.C.). Philetas might be the famous scholar (ca. 340–290 B.C.); Nicander could be either the older poet (*floruit* ca. 250 B.C.) or the younger (*floruit* ca. 200 B.C. according to Cameron (1995: 199–202), ca. 150–30 according to Gow-Schofield (1953: 8)). Others are impossible to date: Agis, Antimachus, Aristodicus, Ariston, Artemon, Carphyllides, Dionysius of Rhodes, Dionysius of Cyzicus, Hecataeus of Thasus, Aeschylus, Hegemon, Philoxenus (third century B.C.?), Glaucus, Nicarchus, Nicomachus, Timocles. List in Radinger (1895: 92, n. 1), but I exclude Pisander of Rhodes, Demetrius of Bithynia and Xenocritus of Rhodes, who occur outside firmly Meleagrian contexts.

⁵ We have only two epigrams of Polystratus, Zenodotus and Amyntes, on whom see below, and one of Moschus. I do not include those ascribed to Dionysius, whose name hides several persons; see Gow-Page (1965: 2.231) and Page (1981: 40–1).

⁶ E.g., on Myron's *Cow* (AP 9.720–4 = 36–40 GP) or riddle epitaphs (AP 7.423–7 = 28–32 GP). On imitation in Antipater see Argentieri (2003: 84–8).

⁷ Votive catalogues: AP 6.294–5, 297, 299 (= 2–5 GP). Hair epigram: AP 12.31 (= 1 GP); on the *topos* see Tarán (1985).

Maybe Meleager was not wrong in disliking second-century epigram, which—by overusing traditional themes—had come to a crisis. These weary poets would probably subscribe to the lament of the late fifth century epic poet Choerilus (fr. 2 Bernabé), who confessed himself envious of his earlier colleagues who could sing whatever they wanted without risk of repeating what had already been said. Ancient writers surely had a better opinion of imitation than we who still live in the Romantic worship of originality; yet excessive repetition and reworking must gradually have induced a lack of interest in both poets and readers.

2. *The Origins of Epigram Anthology*

Ironically enough, the wearing out of themes and lack of originality, the major flaws of second century epigram, ultimately produced something totally new: the anthology. Literally a “gathering of flowers,”⁸ it was less a literary than an editorial genre. Its approach was to collect several epigrams on the same topic, visually juxtaposing an original by an older poet with imitations by younger ones. In earlier centuries allusion between authors and models had remained implicit, and it lay with the well-read reader to grasp and appreciate the reference; now this relationship was physically visible on the page, and this juxtaposition allowed the reader better to compare and appraise. Thus poem vied with poem, and the youngest was the anthologist himself. As editor-poet, he was a new figure, not just collecting other people’s epigrams, but adding his own and thus competing with his masters.

The epigram anthologist *par excellence* is Meleager, but we cannot affirm with certainty that he was also the first. Maybe it is only a coincidence, but among the papyri containing epigrams,⁹ the first texts that overtly juxtapose models with imitations are from the second century B.C., the point of deepest weariness in the epigrammatic genre.

One might consider P. Köln V 204 (end of the second century B.C.) a precursor of the epigram anthology. Under the heading Μ[υ]ασάλκου (“by Mnasalces”), it contains six fragmentary epigrams: the fourth, under

⁸ On the word “anthology” see Argentieri (1998: 10, n. 53).

⁹ Cameron (1993: 1–18), Pordomingo (1994), Gutzwiller (1998b: 20–36) and Nita Krevans’ contribution to this companion; a typological classification in Argentieri (1998).

the possible heading [Ἡγησί]ππου (“by Hegesippus”), is a dedication to Artemis by a girl. The poem, but for a different personal name, is *AP* 6.266 (= Hegesippus 6 GP). The heading [Ἡγησί]ππου seems to indicate Hegesippus as the author not of the epigram itself but of the original (*AP* 6.266) which Mnalsalces imitated by simply changing the name. If, as it seems, the poems are all by Mnalsalces, this is not an anthology but an edition of his epigrams; it is however of interest for our purposes that the editor felt the need to specify the author of the model imitated by Mnalsalces.

Much more important is P. Oxy. 662, of the Augustan age, which contains Leonidas *AP* 7.163 (= 70 GP) on Prexo, dead in childbirth; Antipater of Sidon *AP* 7.164 (= 21 GP) on the same theme; Amyntes 1 *FGE* on the same theme; Amyntes 2 *FGE* on the destruction of Sparta in 188 B.C.; Leonidas 51 GP, dedication by a hunter; Antipater of Sidon 48 GP, on the same theme; and the first word of an unknown epigram by Leonidas. The succession Leonidas-Antipater is frequent in *AP*,¹⁰ while we know Amyntes from this papyrus only; the dating of Amyntes 2 *FGE* and his imitation of Antipater (died ca. 100) date him at the end of the second century B.C. This papyrus must be a later copy of his own anthology, independent of Meleager’s *Garland* and probably earlier.¹¹ Amyntes gathers epigrams by subject-matter and adds his own reworking, at least in the case of 1 *FGE*. We may thus consider this papyrus a first attempt at an anthology, although the poor quality of Amyntes’ poetry earned it a short life.

No other epigram papyrus can be fully considered an anthology, either because too poorly preserved to betray its arrangement, because

¹⁰ Argentieri (2004: 85–6, 92).

¹¹ Wifstrand (1926: 33–6); see Page (1981: 5–6). Cameron (1993: 11–2) makes of him “an older contemporary of Meleager” because “the so-called Corrector ascribes to him *AP* 6.114, a poem on Philip V of Macedon (221–179 B.C.),” and in this view P. Oxy. 662 would be an excerpt from Meleager’s *Garland*. Things are quite complicated: the lemma to 6.114 reads ἀνάθημα τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ παρὰ Φιλίππου τοῦ αὐτοῦ, and this would mean “by Simias,” the author of the preceding epigram (chronologically impossible, since Simias dates to the fourth or third century B.C.; the author is actually Samius). The Corrector changed the last words into παρὰ Φιλίππου τοῦ Ἀμύντου, meaning “by Amyntes” not the poet, as Cameron thinks, but the father of Philip; the Corrector apparently confused Philip V (son of Demetrius II) with the more famous Philip II (son of Amyntes III), then he made another mistake adding an absurd Φιλίππου Θεσσαλονικέως to mean the author. Thus it seems impossible to argue that the poet “Amyntes does in fact appear in a Meleagrian series” (Cameron 1993: 12).

its epigrams are not linked by subject-matter,¹² or because there are only older epigrams without any new. The anthology, a well-structured, complex editorial type, required a long period of incubation, after which Meleager brought it to sophisticated maturity.

3. *Meleager*

3.1. *Life and Works*

Meleager himself gives us several biographical data in four fictitious self-epitaphs (*AP* 7.417–419, 421 = 2–5 GP).¹³ A son of Menecrates, he was born in Gadara, an important Syrian town, and the birthplace two centuries earlier of the Cynic philosopher Menippus, the inventor of Menippean satire, a genre mixing prose and poetry which spread the ideals of Cynicism. As a young boy Meleager moved to Tyre, a large coastal town rich in trade and philosophy, where he spent most of his life.

Like many epigrammatists, Meleager published several *libelli* over the years. He claims to have written love poems (4.3, 5.10 GP), probably those now in *AP* 5 and 12,¹⁴ and Menippean satires he calls *Graces* (Χόριτες, 2.4, 3.6, 4.4, 5.14 GP; see also Anon. 45.2 *FGE*).¹⁵ Meleager's support for Cynicism was both literary and philosophical: in 2.5–6 GP, consonant with Cynic cosmopolitanism, he bids the passerby to pay no attention to his Syrian birth because we all are citizens of the world.

¹² P. Freib. 4 (first century B.C.) possibly opens with three epigrams on Homer, but of the second nothing survives; see Wifstrand (1926: 30–3).

¹³ For a closer reading see Gutzwiller (1998a: 81–8). The anonymous 7.416 (= Anon. 45 *FGE*) is inside a firmly Meleagrian context but considers Meleager dead, so it is either an intruder or another self-epitaph by Meleager. Already the *corrector* of *AP* supported the second view; see Page (1981: 351).

¹⁴ *AP* 12.256 compares several boys of Tyre to the flowers of a garland. Since the same metaphor occurs in the *Garland's* proem *AP* 4.1, some scholars consider this the proem of a book of *paidika*; see Ouvré (1894a: 30–1); contra, Radinger (1895: 109–12) and Wifstrand (1926: 72–5).

¹⁵ Athenaeus (11.107, 4.45) quotes satire titles like *Symposium* (Συμπόσιον) and *Comparison between Gruel and Lentil-Soup* (Λεκίθου καὶ φακῆς σύγκρισις). On Meleager's satires see Ouvré (1894a: 59–66), Radinger (1895: 8–13), Gutzwiller (1998a).

In his old age he moved to and became citizen of Cos. There he composed the work that made his fame, the *Garland* (Στέφανος), dedicated to Diocles.¹⁶

The scholia to these self-epitaphs by the *AP* scribe called J simply deduce information from the epigrams, providing little help. However, J's long scholium to *AP* 4.1 on pp. 81–2 of the Codex Palatinus says: "He was from Gadara, as he himself recorded in the preceding poems; he flourished under the last Seleucus," that is, Seleucus VI, who reigned in 95 B.C. Meleager must thus have been born ca. 130–120. He may have moved from Gadara to Tyre when his native town was conquered by king Alexander Iannaeus in 98,¹⁷ and to Cos in the late eighties after Mithridates' devastations.¹⁸ If the late age he says he reached is not just a part of the poet's pose, his life might have lasted until at least 70.

The latest datable poet included in the *Garland* is Antipater of Sidon (ca. 180–100 B.C.); the earliest excluded is Philodemus of Gadara (ca. 110–40). This has led scholars to date Meleager's *Garland* to about 90 or shortly after; but since we learn from the self-epitaphs that he assembled it in Cos as an old man (i.e., at least fifty years old), it is better dated to ca. 80 or later. Philodemus' exclusion is no problem in this regard, since he lived in a very different milieu from Meleager's.¹⁹

3.2. *The poets of the Garland*

The *Garland* opened with a long proem (1 GP = *AP* 4.1) where Meleager dedicates his anthology to Diocles and lists 47 poets included beside himself: Anyte, Moero, Sappho, Melanippides, Simonides, Nossis, Rhianus, Erinna, Alcaeus, Samius, Leonidas, Mnasalces, Pamphilus, Pancrates, Tymnes, Nicias, Euphemus, Damagetus, Callimachus, Euphorion, Dioscorides, Hegesippus, Perses, Diotimus, Menecrates, Nicaenetus, Phaennus, Simias, Parthenides, Bacchylides, Anacreon, Archilochus, Alexander (Aetolus), Polyclitus, Polystratus, Antipater, Hermodorus,

¹⁶ Probably Diocles of Magnesia, author of an Ἐπιδρομή τῶν φιλοσόφων (*Brief History of Philosophers*) often quoted by Diogenes Laertius; see *RE* 5.1, col. 798–801.

¹⁷ Radinger (1895: 5); Ouvre (1894a: 26) assumes 120/110 B.C. but he gives no reason.

¹⁸ Neppi Modona (1933: 47–8).

¹⁹ That is the circle of L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus in Herculaneum (Sider 1997: 7–11). A yet later date might be indicated by Philip's alleged inclusion of Archias (Gow-Page 1968: 2.433–5), the poetaster born ca. 120 B.C. and defended by Cicero in 62 B.C.; but no epigram by him occurs in a firmly Meleagrian context.

Posidippus, Hedylus, Asclepiades (called Sicelides), Plato, Aratus, Chaeremon, Phaedimus, Antagoras, Theodoridas, and Phantias; then there are ἄλλων δ' ἔρνεα πολλὰ νεόγραφα ("many sprouts recently written by others," 1.55 GP).²⁰

The order of the poets seems random, although it may be no coincidence that among the first eight poets five are women, or that Posidippus, Hedylus, and Asclepiades, friends operating in the Alexandrian court, occur side by side.

Each name is coupled with a flower, also without any apparently discernible criterion. In some cases the combination is understandable: for instance, Antipater, born in the Phoenician town of Sidon, is associated with Phoenician henna. But above all, gathering poets as flowers means to make a collection-garland; hence the title Στέφανος ("Garland") of the work.

From these authors Meleager chose epigrams which best fit his personal taste, mainly erotic, votive, sepulchral, and epideictic, although in the third and second centuries B.C. other genres were being practised. The Posidippus papyrus contains many epigrams formally belonging to such sub-genres as *lithika* ("on stones") or *hippika* ("on horse races"), all of which, however, essentially respond to the needs of the Ptolemaic court. Before the publication of the papyrus, court epigram appeared to be less frequent in the third century B.C. than in Philip's *Garland*,²¹ although we already knew from outside *AP* that Aratus, Alexander Aetolus, Antagoras and Samius had relationships with the Macedonian dynasty; Philitas, Asclepiades, Posidippus, Hedylus and Callimachus with the Ptolemies; Euphorion with the Seleucids; the younger Nicander with the Attalids; and Leonidas with Pyrrhus king of Epirus. But discoveries such as the Milan papyrus happen seldom, and we are condemned to have a partial picture of the work of these poets. We must always remember that the history of Hellenistic epigram as we know it is the one Meleager transmitted.

To this collection Meleager added his own epigrams. Almost all are amatory, though often influenced by other styles and genres, artfully melded together. Sometimes he imitates his predecessors but always with a novel personal touch; frequently his epigrams are completely

²⁰ For the names of these "others" see above, n. 4.

²¹ So von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1924: 1.122).

unprecedented.²² With Meleager and his anthology the first season of Hellenistic epigram ends on a high note.

3.3. *Reconstructing the Garland*

Besides the opening poem of the *Garland*, *AP* 4.1, we happen to know the closing one, *AP* 12.257 (= 129 GP), where the *coronis*, the diacritical mark written at the end of papyrus rolls, speaks to announce the end of the collection.²³

To try to grasp the sweep of the *Garland*, we must first calculate how much of it has come down to us. This is done not only by counting the single epigrams of authors mentioned in the proem, but also by observing the long sequences of Meleagrian authors preserved more or less unaltered in *AP*, the so-called “Meleagrian series.” This allows us to discover other poets which Meleager did not mention explicitly but who entered his anthology.

Alan Cameron has illustrated the general principle by which Constantine Cephalas organized his books when in ca. A.D. 900 he reworked earlier epigram collections into what was shortly thereafter reshaped into *AP*.²⁴ It is generally agreed that despite mistakes, omissions, and repetitions, a well-defined and discernible scheme shapes his major books (namely 5, 6, 7, 9, 10): a first part arranged by subject-matter; a second made up of long extracts from the three major earlier epigram collections (Meleager, Philip, Agathias); a third, of miscellaneous epigrams without any topic or concern for source.

The first place to look for Meleagrian series is the second part of a book, although they can also be found in other Cephalan books which do not follow this ternary framework. Book 12, for instance, was based almost entirely on Strato (epp. 1–11 and 175–255) and Meleager (epp. 36–171), and there Cephalas used neither Philip nor Agathias, both of whom avoided paederastic epigram.²⁵

²² For an overall assessment on Meleager’s poetry see Ouvré (1894a), Radinger (1895: 22–40), Gow-Page (1965: 2.591–3).

²³ On the *coronis* see Stephen (1959). Ouvré (1894a: 92) considers conclusory the epigram where Meleager salutes his three homelands (it is unclear which one); see also Reitzenstein (1893: 139, n. 2). On *AP* 4.1 and 12.257, see also Gutzwiller (1998b: 279–81).

²⁴ Cameron (1993: 121–37).

²⁵ Besides *AP* 12, the pattern does not apply to *AP* 4 (proems) nor to *AP* 11, maybe because of its twofold nature (sympotic and satirical epigrams); it is far from clear why it occurs twice in *AP* 6.

Since discovering a Meleagrian series allows us to gain hundreds of *Garland* lines at once, many scholars have spent their energies on this issue, though not always with analogous conclusions. The first, Passow (1835) and Weigand (1845–7), confined themselves to long and obvious sections; later, Weißhäupl (1889: 2–13) and Stadtmüller (1896–1906) spotted series as short as two or three epigrams, which are probably due to chance. Lenzinger (1975: 1–20 and table I) proceeded with a healthier caution, and his table of the major Meleagrian sections has been adapted and adopted by Cameron (1993: xvi–xvii) and Gutzwiller (1998b: table I):

- 5. 134–215
- 6. 109–57, 210–26, 262–313, 351–58
- 7. 192–203, 207–12, 246–59, 263–73, 406–529, 646–57, 707–40
- 9. 313–37, 563–8
- 12. 36–171²⁶

Adding to these blocks all the epigrams scattered elsewhere in *AP*, scholars have assembled some 4500 lines of Meleager's *Garland*. But how much of it was lost between its first edition and A.D. 900? Two abridged versions of the anthology on first-century papyri, BKT V 1.75 f. and P. Oxy. 3324 (see below) show no new epigram, and that induces optimism. Yet, there is a huge lacuna inside *AP* 9,²⁷ where many poems might have come from Meleager, who was fond of epideictic-ecphrastic epigrams. The *Garland* must thus have contained about 6000 lines—four rolls, considering the capacity of ancient papyrus rolls.²⁸

Like many large collections, the *Garland* was heavily reworked over the centuries. Already in the Augustan age abridged versions circulated: BKT V 1.75 f. has seven epigrams but others juxtaposed with them in *AP* are missing; P. Oxy. 3324 has four epigrams of Meleager alone.

²⁶ Since Theocritus was not included by Meleager (Gow (1952: 2.523–4)), 7.646–57 cannot be extended up to 665, as Weißhäupl and Cameron do; Stadtmüller stops it at 665 and Gutzwiller at 656. On the same grounds 9.313–37 cannot be extended to the Theocritean 338, as all scholars do. Weißhäupl identifies a section, 9.715–31, on Myron's *Cow*, but 717 and 718 are by Euenus (= 8–9 GP *Garland*), a name hiding several poets. On the same ground I exclude Euenus 12.172 (= 7 GP *Garland*) from the series 12.36–171, on whose limits there is no agreement at all (Weißhäupl: 36–171/2?; Gutzwiller: 37–168; Cameron: 36–174).

²⁷ *AP* 9 is the result of a conflation of a book of epideictic epigrams (9a) with another of ecphrastic (9b), which took place after the loss of the end of the former and of the beginning of the latter. The seam is therefore indiscernible because of a huge lacuna (ca. 450 epigrams) between 9.583 and 584; see Wifstrand (1926: 76–86), Gow (1958a: 51–5) and Lauxtermann (1998).

²⁸ Cameron (1993: 24–8); on papyri dimensions see Cavallo (1994: 622–9).

When the *Garland* came into the hands of Cephalas, it was rather different and shorter than it had first been.²⁹

3.4. *Organizing principles*

To understand the arrangement of the many epigrams between the *AP* 4.1 and 12.257, we must now turn to the analysis of Meleager's organizing principles, an issue that has heavily occupied *AP* studies in the last century.

The issue began with a statement in the long scholium on pp. 81–2 of *AP*: (Μελέαγρος) συνέταξεν δὲ αὐτὰ (τὰ ἐπιγράμματα) κατὰ στοιχεῖον, ἀλλὰ Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ ἐπονομαζόμενος Κεφαλᾶς συνέχεεν αὐτὰ ἀφορίσας εἰς κεφάλαια διάφορα, ἥγουν ἐρωτικά ἰδίως καὶ ἀναθηματικά καὶ ἐπιτύμβια καὶ ἐπιδεικτικά, ὥς νῦν ὑποτέτακται ἐν τῷ παρόντι πτυκτίῳ (“[Meleager] arranged them alphabetically, but Constantine called Cephalas mixed them by distributing them into various chapters, namely erotic, votive, sepulchral and epideictic, as they are arranged now in the present codex”).

Within just a few years at the end of the nineteenth century, scholars had refuted the scholium. First Reitzenstein (1893: 276, n. 1) cast some doubts on it in a short footnote; then Radinger (1895: 100–7) thoroughly refuted it. He did so by highlighting how extant *Garland* sections show a twofold arrangement, based on both a model-imitation succession and thematic or lexical echoes,³⁰ with which Cephalas could hardly be credited. Moreover, since Philippan sections are alphabetical, it would be odd if Cephalas had rearranged the Meleagrian material and left Philip's unaltered. Basson (1917: 36–7) added that neither does the opening poem begin with α, nor the closing with ω.

On these grounds, Wifstrand (1926: 8–22) reconstructed the general structure of the sepulchral and the erotic section of the *Garland*, the

²⁹ Cameron (1993: 43–8), highlighting the variants between epigrams mistakenly repeated by Cephalas, concludes that he had two different copies of both *Garlands*, but the conclusion is not inevitable: he might have had two different texts of those epigrams in miscellaneous collections other than the *Garlands*.

³⁰ See also Guichard (2000). A single series is arranged alphabetically, viz. 7.194–203 (ΑΑΑΔΕΟΟΟΟ); this may be due to Cephalas but possibly to chance: first, the occurrence of initials is uneven; second, 194–5 and 200–3 begin with the same words (respectively ἀκρίδα/ἀκρίς and οὐκέτι). The same is true for 7.263–71 spotted by Passow and Ouvré (1894a: 91, n. 3): the initials are ΚΕΝΝΝΝΙΤΩ, but 265–8 all begin with the stem νου-, and what's more, the series includes 272 (Ν) and 273 (Ε) as well, which break the alleged alphabetical arrangement.

homosexual and heterosexual epigrams being mixed together in the latter before Cephala separated them into *AP* 5 and *AP* 12 on moral grounds. These arguments, further developed by Gow-Page (1965: 2.xvii–xxi) and Cameron (1993: 19–24), are now generally accepted, and it is even possible to reconstruct the precise structure of the *Garland*, as Gutzwiller (1998b: 277–321 and tables) cleverly did.

In recent years, the Posidippus papyrus has given new impetus to the study of techniques of arrangement.³¹ The papyrus, besides more general categories later taken up by Cephala (e.g., ἀναθηματικά, “votive”), shows more detailed ones (e.g., οἰωνοσκοπικά, “on bird omens”), thus demonstrating that in the third century B.C. epigrams were distinguished not only by genre, but also by content. Within these sections, the poems are linked to each other by thematic analogy or contrast, or even subtler associations.

This resembles the practice of Meleager. Since his *Garland* was in four books, it has reasonably been assumed that there were an erotic, a votive, a sepulchral and an epideictic-ecphrastic book.³² But this subdivision may not be taken too strictly: inside each book there were several epigrams which by genre would fit better in another book, but whose presence is owed to subject-matter affinity.

A closer look at a sequence from *AP* 6 (210–26), the book of votive epigrams, best highlights the richness and pleasantness of Meleager’s arrangement:

210–1: *erotic offerings* (= Philitas 1 GP, Leonidas 2 GP).

212–7: *six epigrams by Simonides*. The last one (= 2 GP), a dress offered to Cybele by a Gallus who survived an encounter with a lion, introduces the next group.

218–21: *offerings of people who survived encounters with a lion*. 218 (= Alcaeus 21 GP), 220 (= Dioscorides 16 GP), and 219 (= Antipater of Sidon 64 GP, a long epideictic with no offering), vary 217; 221 (= Leonidas 53 GP), an offering by goatherds left unscathed in an encounter with a lion, begins with the same word as 217, χειμερίην.

222–4: *offering of sea animals*. In 222 (Theodoridas = 4 GP) the *skolopendra*, a sea monster, is dedicated; so too in 223, an imitation by Antipater (= 50 GP); in 224 (Theodoridas = 5 GP) the offering is a seashell.

225–6: *poor people*. In 225 (= Nicaenetus 1 GP) a poor countrywoman offers garlands; 226 (= Leonidas 87 GP) describes a small farm and has nothing votive.

³¹ Gutzwiller (2004a); Lavigne and Romano (2004); Gauly (2005).

³² Cameron (1993: 26).

After the elegant transition from 212–7 (arrangement by author) to 218–21 (arrangement by subject-matter), 222–3 assure a smooth switch from “monstrous animals” to “marine offerings.” Even if this series has been somewhat abridged, Meleager’s subtle arrangement is still clearly discernible.

In this series neither 220 nor 226 are votive epigrams, and commentators never fail to notice that they should not be in *AP* 6. However, in Meleager’s *Garland*, where subject-matter and/or lexical affinity could trump genre, they became misfits only in Cephalas’ collection, which required an arrangement by genre. The charge of carelessness usually levelled against Cephalas must be refined when talking about Meleagrian sections: Cephalas’ mistake, for his own purposes, was not to remove generically inappropriate poems from the long series he was pasting into his genre-based contexts.

4. *Philip*

4.1. *Chronology of Philip’s Garland*

No other author mentions Philip nor do *AP* scholiasts give any clue about his dating. He is, however, datable on the basis of information internal to his epigrams, although he relates nothing personal. Like many poets of his *Garland*, Philip lived at the emperor’s court, where a poet was appreciated less for sincerity in speaking of himself than for his craftsmanship in celebrating other people’s achievements. Cichorius (1922: 341–55) first pinpointed the chronological references inside Philip’s epigrams, many of which are related to the rule of Caligula, and more precisely to the years A.D. 37–9. In 9.285 (= 4 *GP Garland*) the emperor has the image of the deified Augustus carried on a chariot drawn by an elephant; 6.240 (= 3 *GP Garland*) is about an illness of the emperor; 11.321 and 347 (= 60–1 *GP Garland*) attack scholars (whom Caligula loved much less than his predecessor Tiberius); 9.562 (= Crinagoras 39 *GP Garland*) is about a parrot taught to hail and flatter the emperor; in 9.778 (= 6 *GP Garland*) a fine carpet is sent to the emperor by princess Cypros to persuade him to support the political aims of her cousin Herodes Agrippa. According to Cichorius, only 6.236 (= 2 *GP Garland*) on the battle of Actium, a topic unwelcome to Caligula, as great-grandson of Mark Anthony, and 9.708 (= 57 *GP Garland*), praising of the harbor-mole of Puteoli without mention of

the short-lived pontoon bridge built by Caligula, can be dated under Tiberius. The absence from all major Philippan sections of Gaetulicus, a former consul executed for conspiracy in October 39, led Cichorius to date Philip's *Garland* to A.D. 40, between the execution of Gaetulicus and the death of Caligula (January 41), since Philip would have surely chosen not to include a conspirer to avoid hurting Caligula's feelings. As for the dedicatee of the collection, Cichorius identifies the "noble Camillus" (ἑσθλὲ Κάμιλλε, *AP* 4.2.5) either with L. Arruntius Camillus Scribonianus, a former consul who rebelled in A.D. 42 against Claudius, or with his (step-)brother M. Furius Camillus, *frater arvalis* in A.D. 38. Gow-Page (1968: 1.xlix) incline to the former, whom Philip chose as *patronus* before he fell into disgrace, thus confirming Cichorius' dating of the *Garland* under Caligula: Philip would never have addressed the brother of the mutineer under Claudius' rule.

The assumption is plausible; yet Philip could safely celebrate Camillus under the rule of Nero. The dating of the *Garland* to A.D. 40 is in fact contradicted by *AP* 9.178 (= Antiphilus 6 *GP Garland*) on the liberation of Rhodes by "Caesar Nero." Müller (1935: 14–8) ascribed the epigram to A.D. 53, when Nero gave back to the Rhodians the freedom taken away by Claudius nine years before;³³ Hartigan (1979: 108–9) went further, and postponed the date of Philip 57 *GP Garland* on the harbor-mole of Puteoli, arguing that it is an imitation of Antiphilus 3 *GP Garland* (7.379), dealing with the same theme and written under Nero. In short, there are solid grounds for dating the *Garland* under Nero in the mid-fifties of the first century A.D., when Philip could safely dedicate his collection to Marcus Furius Camillus in spite of the turbulent past of his (step-)brother.

4.2. *The poets of the Garland*

The opening poem of Philip's *Garland*, *AP* 4.2 (= 1 *GP Garland*) is much shorter than Meleager's (14 lines as compared to 58); here Philip figures his collection as an imitative continuation of Meleager (*AP* 4.2.3–4: ἀντανέπλεξα/τοῖς Μελεαγρείοις ὥς ἵκελον στεφάνοις, "In rivalry, I have plaited garlands much in the manner of Meleager's"). The oldest

³³ Gow-Page (1968: 1.xlvii) accept A.D. 53 as a date but assume that it entered *AP* from another source in order to preserve the traditional date of Philip's *Garland*. Contra, Cameron (1993: 56–65, esp. 56–8).

poet included is the youngest excluded by Meleager, the Epicurean Philodemus of Gadara, who lived ca. 110–40 B.C.

Philip mentions 13 poets, again with no chronological concern and each associated with a flower: Antipater (of Thessalonica), Crinagoras, Antiphilus, Tullius, Philodemus, Parmenion, Antiphanes, Automedon, Zonas, Bianor, Antigonus, Diodorus,³⁴ and Euenus. All are represented in the extant epigrams. To tell from its extant sections, this *Garland* also contained at least 25 more poets.³⁵ The total distribution by date of birth is as follows:

110–100 B.C.	Philodemus, Scaevola
80–60 B.C.	Crinagoras, Zonas, Erucius, Adaeus (?), Aemilianus (?), Diocles (?)
ca. 40 B.C.	Antipater, Apollonides, Diodorus [of Sardis], Sabinus (?), Boethus (?),
ca. 30–20 B.C.	Antistius, Marcus Argentarius, Bassus, Bianor, Honestus, Macedonius (?)
ca. A.D. 1–10	Antiphilus, Polemon, Geminus ³⁶

Unlike Meleager, who collected almost six centuries of epigram, Philip covered only a hundred years or slightly more, so that there are no chronological lacunas as in his predecessor, while there are several contemporary or slightly older poets than himself.

Again we cannot determine many authors' date and identity; moreover, the many question marks in the table remind us that some identification is based on nothing more than a coincidence of name with some obscure character of the first century B.C. To make things worse, some of these names are quite common (Aemilianus, Diocles, Sabinus), thus making the assumption even weaker.

Not a few of these poets were of high standing and fame in their time. Scaevola, bound to Cicero's family, was *tribunus plebis* in 54 B.C.; Zonas

³⁴ If Gow-Page's reconstruction (1968: 2.264) is correct, this name is both Diodorus of Sardis, "the younger" (to distinguish him from Diodorus Zonas of Sardis) and Diodorus of Tarsus, "the Grammarian."

³⁵ Adaeus, Antistius, Apollonides, Marcus Argentarius, Bassus, Boethus, Diocles, Diotimus, Aemilianus, Epigonus, Erucius, Etruscus, Heraclides, Honestus, Maccius, Macedonius, Myrinus, Polemon, Quintus, Sabinus, Scaevola, Secundus, Serapion, Thallus and Philip himself. Antimedon is represented by a single distich beginning with α (*AP* 11.46 = 1 *GP Garland*) at the end of the Philippan section *AP* 11.23–46, arranged in reverse alphabetical order.

³⁶ Of uncertain chronology: Antigonus, Antimedon, Antiphanes, Automedon, Diodorus [of Tarsus], Diotimus, Epigonus, Etruscus, Euenus, Heraclides, Maccius, Myrinus, Parmenion, Quintus, Secundus, Serapion and Thallus.

was politically active in Lydia; Crinagoras, a grandee of Mytilene, came to Rome as an ambassador at least three times (probably 48, 45 and 25 B.C.); Antistius was a Macedonian noble exiled in A.D. 21; Gaetulicus was consul in A.D. 26; Polemon was king of Pontus from A.D. 37 to 63; Geminus was *consul suffectus* in A.D. 46; the dedicatee came from the distinguished family of Camilli. Others, like Philodemus, Antipater, Apollonides, Bassus, Antiphilus, Thallus and Philip himself came to Rome looking for success and were *clientes* of illustrious patrons. Others can be situated in the literary life of the time: Diodorus of Sardis was a friend of Strabo, Erucius celebrates the death of Parthenius of Nicaea with a wild joy betraying a personal conflict, and Sabinus is perhaps a literary friend of Ovid.

Many epigrams of Philip's *Garland* show us the social, political and cultural life in Rome in the first centuries B.C. and A.D. and are therefore of great interest. In this period epigram seems to have been either a light entertainment practised by politicians or rhetors in their leisure, or a kind of occasional poetry, suited to celebrate quickly any event of court life in the hope of meeting the approval of the powerful. The *Garland* itself, so full of flattering epigrams, might even have been assembled by Philip as a present for the court.

The taste exhibited by Philip's *Garland* is very unlike Meleager's. Paederastic poems are completely absent, amatory poems are few; epitaphs and offerings, still widely represented, show little originality. The major novelty comes from satiric and epideictic epigram, the latter occurring as bizarre anecdote, descriptive picture, or celebratory piece.³⁷

Philip is typical of the new vogue. Of the roughly 80 epigrams ascribed to him with certainty, those examined earlier reveal that he was a court poet or at least that he was trying to be one; among the others, anecdote epigrams are preponderant. His poetical talent (like the sincerity of his inspiration) seems not to have been of the highest order.

4.3. *Reconstructing the Garland*

Philip's *Garland* opened with a proem (*AP* 4.2) based on a floral metaphor, like Meleager's; but this time we seem to have lost the closing

³⁷ Argentieri (2003: 71–5); on scopic epigram see Longo (1967: 92–111) and Nisbet (2003a) and Nisbet on satiric epigram in this volume; on epideictic Lauxtermann (1998) and Rossi (2002).

poem, if there was any. We would expect it to begin with an ω , since the collection, as we will see more in detail, was alphabetically arranged; but none of the extant pieces beginning so (*AP* 7.495 = 34 *GP Garland*; 9.311 = 51 *GP Garland*; *AP* 93 = 68 *GP Garland*; *AP* 240 = 75 *GP Garland*) is a likely candidate.

To reconstruct the collection the same rules apply as for Meleager's, but with the important difference that the extant sections of Philip's *Garland* are arranged alphabetically and therefore easier to detect in *AP*:

5. 104–33
6. 87–108, 227–61
7. 364–405, 622–45
9. 215–312, 403–23, 541–62
10. 17–25
11. 23–46, 318–27³⁸

Having added from these sequences the names of roughly 25 poets not named by Philip, as well as adding the epigrams scattered outside the series, Gow-Page printed some 3500 lines of the *Garland*, a collection far shorter than Meleager's. Since it was considerably less popular—we do not possess any Philippan papyrus—it is difficult to estimate how many lines were lost between its publication and Cephalas' reworking. However, given Philip's fondness for epideictic, we can assume that the large lacuna between *AP* 9.583 and 584 contained many *Garland* epigrams. A conjecture of ca. 4500 lines in three books will not take us very far from reality.³⁹

Within his own books he divided up alphabetical sections, and included far more poems of some initial letters than others. These facts make us think that he had one or more abridged and/or reworked versions.⁴⁰ And since all Philippan sections in *AP* 5, 6, 7, and 9 (except

³⁸ *AP* 6.87–108 opens with an *adespota* beginning with α , so we may doubt whether it is really Philippan. Weißhäupl (1889: 27) extends 9.403–23 (AAAAΔEEZHHHHHHΘΙΚΜΝΠΣ) after a short break to 428–30 (ΣΤΤ). In 9.541–62 and 11.318–27 there are two apparent intruders which break the alphabetical succession, the anonymous iambic 9.547 and 11.323 by Palladas (Argentieri 2003: 43–4). In 11.23–46 the alphabetical order is reversed for unclear reasons. Two further Philippan series are not alphabetically arranged, 7.233–40 and 9.81–9; others listed by Gow-Page (1968: 1.xiii) might be due to chance.

³⁹ Radinger (1895: 107–9); Cameron (1993: 33–4).

⁴⁰ Gow-Page (1968: 1.xviii–xix); see above, n. 29, on Cameron's hypothesis that Cephalas had two different copies of both *Garlands*.

for 9.403–423) immediately precede Meleagrian series,⁴¹ Cephalas may have used collections composed of sections from both *Garlands*.

4.4. *The organizing principles*

The alphabetical principle in Philip is self-evident, starting with the opening poem *AP* 4.2, which begins with α . Certainty on this point has always been so strong that several scholars, beginning with scribe J, misunderstood Philip's statement, "In rivalry, I have plaited garlands much in the manner of Meleager's," (*AP* 4.2.3–4) to imply an alphabetic arrangement in Meleager as well. This criterion applies only to the first letter, without regard for the second.⁴² So, for example, in the series 9.403–23 the first four epigrams begin respectively with the words $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\hat{\alpha}$ καλόν, Ἀδρήστεια, and ἀργυρέη.

Philip's alphabetical arrangement made Cephalas' work considerably more complicated. While he could transfer a long sepulchral section from Meleager more or less unaltered into his book 7, with Philip he had to sort every single epigram into his genre-based books.

But did each of the three Philipian books go from α to ω or did the alphabet run through all the books, so that they were divided, to use Cameron's example, α - θ , ι - π and ρ - ω ? On the first hypothesis, if every book went from α to ω , along with the alphabetical criterion there must have been a subject-matter subdivision. In this case, Cephalas would simply have copied long Philipian sections already thematically consistent, as with Meleager. But this would mean that the misfits occurring in almost every Philipian section (e.g., the epitaph *AP* 5.108 among the *erotica*)⁴³ are Philip's fault, which is hardly believable. They must be therefore due to Cephalas' (in)famous carelessness. The three books of Philip's *Garland* seem thus to have been one long, uninterrupted alphabetical sequence; regardless of any thematic or generic arrangement.⁴⁴ Indeed, the genres collected and practised by Philip—erotic, votive, sepulchral, satirical and epideictic—are too many to bear a facile tripartite division on the basis of genre alone.

⁴¹ Weißhäupl (1889: 25–6), Gow-Page (1968: 1.xix), Cameron (1993: 46).

⁴² Cameron (1993: 36–40).

⁴³ Further such instances given by Gow-Page (1968: 1.xv) and Cameron (1993: 30–1).

⁴⁴ Radinger (1895: 108–9); Gow-Page (1968: 1.xv–xviii); Cameron (1993: 33–6).

5. *Conclusion*

If it is true that only analogous entities can be compared, a comparison of the two *Garlands* is a pointless operation. The first was composed in an Eastern Mediterranean milieu where the Roman Republic was only one of many contestants in the struggle for supremacy; the second saw the light under the first dynasty of the Roman Empire, the Julio-Claudians. Meleager, as an authentic heir of the Hellenistic poets, arranged his collection according to a subtle and complex criterion; Philip, living in a world where school education and rhetoric were a crucial means to get ahead in politics or at court, adopted a principle rooted in school practice and scholarship. Meleager's *Garland* includes great Hellenistic poets often already known from sources other than *AP*; Philip's contains poets who are often mere names or whose best achievements were extra-literary. Meleager focused on specifically "lyric" epigrams and excluded court poems, although the latter were a frequent occurrence in Hellenistic poetry; in Philip's collection some epigrammatic sub-genres decline while others rise, like the short pieces that vividly reflect court life.

Yet, in spite of their differences, both *Garlands* afford a snapshot of the history of epigram at two specific points—albeit one that lacks objectivity, but bears all the marks of personally and historically conditioned acts of selection by two individuals, Meleager and Philip, each with his own tastes and aims.

METER AND DICTION:
FROM REFINEMENT TO MANNERISM

Enrico Magnelli*

The First Hellenistic Period: Complexity in Disguise

Statius' praise of his father's literary culture (*Silu.* 5.3.156–57)—

*Tu pandere doctus
carmina Battidae latebrasque Lycophronis atri.*

You were skilled to expound the poems of Battus' son and the lurking places of obscure Lycophron.

—echoes an opinion widespread both nowadays and in the Imperial age, that Callimachus' poetry is difficult and its elucidation requires much scholarly work.¹ Were all of Callimachus' works lost except his epigrams, no modern scholar could—at first glance—subscribe to this point of view. The *Aitia*, *Iambi*, smaller elegiac poems and partly also the *Hymns* often feature challenging erudition coupled with rare glosses, morphological peculiarities, sometimes even a highly elaborate word order. The reader will encounter nothing of this kind in Callimachus' surviving epigrams. Just compare some lines from the second book of the *Aitia* (fr. 43.46–53 Pf. = 50.46–53 Massimilla):

οἶδα Γέλα, ποταμοῦ, κεφαλῇ ἐπὶ κείμενον ἄστυ
Λίνδοθεν ἀρχαίῃ [σ]κιμπ[τόμενο]ν γενε[ή],
Μινώη[ν] καὶ Κρήσ[σ]αν, ἵ[να] ζείον[τα] λοετ[ρὰ]
χεῦαν ἐ[π'] Εὐρώπης νίει Κ[ωκαλί]δες·
οἶδα Λεοντίονος[.]δεδρα[.....]......[
καὶ Μεγαρεῖς ἔτερ[οι] τοὺς ἀ[πέ]γασσαν ἐκεῖ

* Translations of Callimachus are from Nisetich (2001); of Theocritus, from Gow (1952); of Posidippus, from Austin in Austin-Bastianini (2002); of Philippan poets, from Gow-Page (1968); of other poets in the *GA*, from Paton (1916–9), adapted where necessary; other texts I translated on my own. I am grateful to Marco Fantuzzi for several illuminating suggestions, and to Danette St. Onge for revising my English.

¹ It is not by chance that Philip of Thessalonica and Antiphanes depict pedantic grammarians as Callimachus' worshippers (see below, n. 39).

Νισαῖοι Μεγαρήες, ἔχω δ' Εὐβοίαν ἐνισπεῖν
 φίλατο κα[ῖ] κεστ[ο]ῦ [δ]εσπότ[ι]ς ἦν Ἑρυκα...

I know the city lying by the mouth of the Gelas, proud of her ancient lineage sprung from Lindos, and Cretan Minoa where the daughters of Cocalos treated Europa's son to a boiling bath. I know of Leontinoi... and one set of Megarians sent there by another, those of Nisaia. I can tell of Euboea and Eryx, loved by the Lady of the Witching Belt...

with one of Callimachus' best known epigrams, on the death of his friend Heraclitus—a subject theoretically not forbidding solemnity and affectation (34 GP = AP 7.80 = 2 Pf.):

εἰπέ τις, Ἡράκλειτε, τὸν μόνον, ἐς δέ με δάκρυ
 ἦγαγεν· ἐμνήσθην δ' ὅσάκις ἀμφοτέροι
 ἠέλιον λέσχη κατεδύσαμεν. ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν που,
 ξεῖν' Ἀλικαρνησεῦ, τετράπαλαι σποδιή·
 αἱ δὲ τεαὶ ζώουσιν ἀηδόνες, ἦσιν ὁ πάντων
 ἄρπακτὴς Αἴδης οὐκ ἐπὶ χεῖρα βαλεῖ.

Your death, a casual remark, moved me to tears,
 for I recalled, Herakleitos, how often you and I
 put the sun to bed with our talking. But all that's left
 of you is ashes now, my friend in Halikarnesos.
 Your *Nightingales* are alive, though: Hades who rips
 all things away will never lay a hand on them.

No affectation here, no abstruse vocabulary or erudite allusions; rare words are very easy to understand, so that their preciousness is almost disguised. Ancient readers may or may not have been aware that τετράπαλαι at line 4 and ἄρπακτὴς at line 6 were either poorly attested forms or Callimachean coinages, but none would have found their meaning unclear.² This holds true for almost all of Callimachus' epigrams. Only the poem on the nautilus offered to Arsinoe (14 GP = Athen. 7.318b = 5 Pf.) appears to be a little less plain (no surprise that an encomiastic piece displays a more elaborate style), yet it has nothing in common with the real complexity of other elegiac works by the same author, like the *Aitia* or *Sosibius' Victory*. A few decades later Euphorion, one of the most gifted Hellenistic poets of the second generation, fits

² Τετράπαλαι seems to be a real *hapax legomenon*; ἄρπακτὴς does not appear elsewhere apart from the much later Σ [Opp.] C. 1.516, and was probably built by Callimachus on the Homeric ἄρπακτήρ (same meaning). Callimachus' use of Homeric *hapax legomena* and other rare words mostly reflects his poetic aims (as Sistakou rightly stresses in this volume), and is not just an obscure game in the manner of Lycophron.

the same mold. His poetry is perhaps not so obscure as scholars used to think, but fragments like the following one are a true challenge to our exegetical skill (fr. 84 Powell = 89 van Groningen):³

κλαίοντες δέ τε κοῦρον ἐπ' ἀγχιάλοις πιτύεσσι
κάτθεσαν, ὅκκοτε δὴ στέφανον ἄθλοισι φορέοντο.
οὐ γάρ πω τρηχεῖα λαβὴ καταμήσατο χειρῶν
Μήνης παῖδα χάρωνα παρ' Ἀσωποῦ γενετείρῃ,
ἔξοτε πυκνὰ σέλινα κατὰ κροτάφων ἐβάλλοντο.

Weeping they laid the youth by the shore, on boughs of pine
which in those days they bore as victor's crown.
Not yet in fact the hard grip of hands had cut down
Moon's bright-eyed son near Asopus' mother—after that,
thick celery they began to put around their temples.

The competent reader knows that lines 2 and 5 refer to the legend according to which the victory crowns at the Isthmian games were made first of pine, later of celery; that the “hard grip of hands” at line 3 belongs to Heracles, while the “bright-eyed son of the Moon” is the Nemean lion; and that Asopus' mother mentioned in line 4 was Celusa, a mountain near Nemea not recorded very often in Greek literature.⁴ It is hard to find in this sheaf of riddles anything in common with Euphorion's epigram on Eudoxus (1 GP = AP 6.279 = 1 van Groningen):

πρώτας ὀππότε' ἔπεξε καλὰς Εὐδοξος ἐθείρας,
Φοῖβω παιδείην ὥπασεν ἀγλαίην·
ἀντὶ δέ οἱ πλοκαμῖδος, Ἐκηβόλε, κάλλος ἐπεῖν
ὥχαρνήθεν αἰεὶ κισσὸς ἀεξόμενος.

When Eudoxus first sheared his beautiful hairs,
he gave to Phoebus the glory of his boyhood;
and now vouchsafe, O Far-shooter, that instead of these tresses
the ever-growing ivy of Acharnae may be his ornament.

The two couplets are absolutely plain, expressing standard contents in standard if elegant form. One finds the same clarity in all or most of the epigrams by Anyte, Nossis, Asclepiades, Rhianus, Mnasalcas and Theodoridas.⁵ For poets like Euphorion were epigrams nothing but

³ On the several questions arising from this fragment, not least the textual problems at lines 1–2, see van Groningen (1977: 153–6) and Magnelli (2002: 52–3, 152–3).

⁴ A most *recherché* mythological allusion, which had escaped scholarly attention until Lloyd-Jones (1979: 17 = 1990: 156–7) acutely pointed it out.

⁵ The latter's abusive epitaph against Mnasalcas is not relevant here, since its

an incidental *divertissement*, the taste and ingenuity of the author better expressed in other literary genres? Maybe: we do not know how many epigrams Euphorion actually wrote—surely more than the surviving two, since Meleager included him among the authors of his *Garland* (1.23 GP = AP 4.1.23). Yet such a theory is untenable in the case of Anyte and Asclepiades, who possibly wrote other works⁶ but were chiefly if not only renowned as epigrammatists. And it is clearly untenable as far as Callimachus is concerned. Both Asclepiades and Callimachus in their epigrams often play on focalization, poetic voice and the reader's interactive role;⁷ both use epigrams to take part in contemporary literary debate and eventually reassert their poetic program. Such poems are not just *παίγνια* (light verses), nor were they written in the pauses from more relevant activities. While usually clear, they are not simple, at least not with regard to their deepest meaning.

The reason for this is probably twofold. It is worth recalling that although literary epigram was not born in the Hellenistic age, in Callimachus' and Asclepiades' time it was still trying to define its identity. The relationship between the short poems written on papyrus and their close ancestors, i.e., epigrams inscribed on stone, was still very relevant.⁸ Here, as well as in other fields, Hellenistic poets were apparently not striving to produce literature from nothing and to cut every link with tradition, but to investigate the unexploited opportunities that traditional genres could offer, thus defining their own aims through careful appropriation of their literary heritage and fruitful dialogue between old and new.⁹ From this point of view, it is quite easy to understand

extravagant compounds are meant to ape comic and dithyrambic style; see Livrea (1989).

⁶ Almost nothing remains of Asclepiades' poems other than epigrams (*SH* 216–9 = fr. 4–6 Guichard). Anyte is credited with hexameter and lyric poetry by ancient sources (*SH* 80–81); cf. Gow-Page (1965: 2.89–90), Gutzwiller (1998b: 54, n. 23), and Magnelli (1999: 250, n. 308). She is usually assigned to the beginning of the Hellenistic age; a detailed attempt to establish a lower chronology has been undertaken by Bernsdorff (2001: 110–9).

⁷ On Callimachus see notably Bing (1995b) and Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 312–28). Focalization and poetic voice(s) in Hellenistic epigrams are now dealt with by Murray in this volume.

⁸ This does not mean that the two were neatly divided; on the contrary, we know that they began to interact well before the Hellenistic age. An up-to-date survey—together with many illuminating analyses—is provided by Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 283–338); see also Meyer (2005) and Bettenworth in this volume.

⁹ Recent scholarship has shown the inadequacy of old labels like “crossing of genres” (the well-known *Kreuzung der Gattungen*) or *l'art pour l'art*, at least as far as the leading third

that many literary epigrams around the 280s were different indeed from inscriptional poems, but not drastically different in purely formal terms. In other words, they were not written like Callimachus' *Aitia*. One century later, when the genre was fully established, there was room for deeper formal innovation—and this, as we shall see, gave birth to Antipater of Sidon's "baroque" style.

Nevertheless, this is only a part of the whole story. "Plainness" is not just due to the influence of the epigraphical tradition; it rather plays a more productive role within the poetics of the epigrammatists. Quoting Richard Hunter's effective definition, many of the best Greek epigrams, by Callimachus' time at least, "are very clearly written as a provocation to speculation. Perhaps no literary genre makes such a direct appeal to the reader's powers of intellectual reconstruction, to the *need* to interpret, as does that of the epigram; the demand for concision makes 'narrative silences' an almost constitutive part of the genre."¹⁰ In my view, (apparent) clarity often cooperates in this. Concealing a poem's subtlety, instead of declaring it, makes the poem more subtle. While Callimachus' epigram on the death of Heraclitus (34 GP) reads smoothly, its innovations—above all the significant change in the medium of mourning, from gravestone to memory¹¹—are cleverly disguised under a veneer of normality. To the naïve reader, ancient and modern alike, it might seem just a beautiful, inspired, yet naïve poem. Only those who were acquainted with reading literature in a more perceptive way could realize that a complex poem lurks behind plain style and easy vocabulary, beyond the linguistic surface. And the poet, far from alerting the reader, rather challenges his interpretative tools: to be rewarded with a better understanding of the epigram, you will have to ponder it without being misled by its reassuring appearance.

Dissonant Trends: Grand Style, Technical Language, Redundant Vocabulary

It goes without saying that the smooth elegance of Callimachus and Asclepiades was not shared by every epigrammatist in the first

century poets are concerned. For a proper assessment of these questions see Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 17–37).

¹⁰ Hunter (1992: 114). Cf. also Bing (1995b).

¹¹ As Hunter (1992) persuasively demonstrates. See also Gutzwiller (1998b: 206–7), and the earlier remarks by Walsh (1990: 1–4).

Hellenistic period. The so-called New Posidippus is a heterogeneous collection: the epitaphs often attain to the highest refinement, while the sections *On stones* and *On bird augury* include several poems written in an unusual, somewhat uneven style.¹² This, together with other features (including length), may account for the exclusion of the new epigrams from Meleager's *Garland*.¹³ Anyway, roughness does not always make for difficult reading: interpretative problems often arise from nothing but the topics themselves—some of them, e.g., the omens in 25 AB or the prodigious stone described in the much disputed 17 AB, were perhaps more familiar to Posidippus' audience than to us. Word order is usually plain. Posidippus 95.1–5 AB is one of the most blatant exceptions. Since, as Bing (2002) has shown, the epigram's dedicatee, Medeios of Olynthus, was an important member of the élite under Ptolemy Philadelphus, it is not strange that Posidippus adopted a more elaborate style to praise Medeios' deeds. Nevertheless, I doubt that it was difficult for ancient readers:

οἶος ὁ χάλκεος οὗτος ἐπ' ὅστέα λεπτὸν ἀνέλκων
 πνεῦμα μόγι[ς] ζῶν ὄμματι συλλέγεται,
 ἐ<κ> νούσωγ ἐσάου το<ί>ονς ὁ τὰ δεινὰ Λιβύσσης
 δήγματα φαρμά<σ>σειν ἀσπίδος εὐρόμενος
 Μήδεις Λάμπωνος Ὀλύνθιος...

Just as this bronze, drawing a weak breath over its bones,
 barely manages to gather some life in its looks,
 such were those saved from disease by the man who knew
 how to cure the terrible bites of the Lydian asp,
 Medeios, son of Lampon, from Olynthus....

Posidippus often shows an inclination for the grand style which finds no close parallel in Callimachus' or Asclepiades' epigrams. It is not surprising to meet such a feature in the court epigrams for Sostratus (115 AB = 11 GP) and Callicrates (116 AB = 12 GP); yet it appears in other poems as well, e.g., Doricha's epitaph (122.5–8 AB = Athen. 13.596c = 17 GP):

¹² At least, this is how it sounds to our taste, modelled as it is on the Meleagrian selection. Among the reasons that led some scholars to question the attribution of the entire *corpus* to a single author, (allegedly) low poetic quality is stressed by Schröder (2004). Nevertheless, as Acosta-Hughes (2004: 41, n. 14) writes, "the passage of time is seeing the weight of scholarly judgment come down in favor of Posidippus." For a recent survey see Garulli (2004: 148–50); cf. also the sensible remarks by Gutzwiller (2005a: 2, n. 3).

¹³ See Sider (2004: 39–41).

Σαπφῶαι δὲ μένουσι φίλης ἔτι καὶ μενέουσιν
 ᾧδῆς αἱ λευκαὶ φθεγγόμεναι σελίδες
 οὐνομα σὸν μακαριστόν, ὃ Ναύκρατις ᾧδε φυλάξει
 ἔστ' ἂν ἦ Νείλου ναῦς ἐφ' ἁλὸς πελάγη.

But the lucid columns of Sappho's lovely ode
 are still here and they will go on celebrating
 your most fortunate name, which Naucratis will thus treasure
 as long as ships sail from the Nile on the waves of the sea.

This is quite different from, say, Callimachus' praise of Aratus (56 GP = AP 9.507 = 27 Pf.) and Theaetetus (57 GP = AP 9.565 = 7 Pf.). One could rightly compare the first lines of the well-known elegy called Posidippus' "Seal" or "Testament" (18 AB = SH 705), where a number of solemn images like "Phoebus of the golden lyre" (Φοίβου χρυσολύρεω, 1–2), "snowy Parnassus" (Παρνησοῦ νιφόεντος, 3) or "writing on the golden columns of your tablets" (γραφάμεναι δέλτων ἐν χρυσέαις σελίσιν, 6) concur in making this poem most unlike Callimachus' prologue to the *Aitia*.¹⁴

During the third century B.C., a similar bent for the grand manner is occasionally shown by other epigrammatists.¹⁵ Nevertheless, this remains an episodic feature in the history of Hellenistic epigram. Much more relevant is the progressive evolution of the genre towards lexical complexity. Vocabulary, not syntax, is where short poems shift from the straightforward to the contrived. The widespread Hellenistic taste for ἔκφρασις (description) affected epigram as well,¹⁶ and this unavoidably made epithets increase: many of them turn out to be rare words or new compounds. Early instances may be "Theocritus" 20.1–4 GP (= AP 9.437 = 4 Gow) on a wooden statue of Priapus:¹⁷

¹⁴ For a stylistic evaluation of Posidippus' lines see Lloyd-Jones (1963: 98–9 = 1990: 193–4), according to whom this elegy is "an example... of the kind of contemporary poetry against which Callimachus and his followers reacted with so much sharpness". Hutchinson (1988: 23–4) shares his view; for a (partly) different opinion see Barigazzi (1968: 216, n. 1).

¹⁵ Dioscorides' epigram on Anacreon (19 GP = AP 7.31 = 19 Galán Vioque) is a telling instance.

¹⁶ Bibliography on this topic is abundant. A comprehensive study is provided by Manakidou (1993); on epigram see also Gutzwiller (2002a) and Männlein-Robert in this volume.

¹⁷ Probably not by Theocritus, but one of his most skilled imitators: see Rossi (2001: 166–7). At line 3 Jahn's ἄσκελές seems right against the transmitted τρισκελές; cf. Gow (1952: 2.530) and Rossi (2001: 156–7).

τήναν τὰν λαύραν, τόθι τὰι δρύες, αἰπόλε, κάμψας
 σύκινον εὐρήσεις ἀρτιγλυφὲς ξόανον
 ἄσκελές, αὐτόφλοιον, ἀνούατον, ἀλλὰ φάλητι
 παιδογόνῳ δυνατὸν Κύπριδος ἔργα τελεῖν....

Follow yonder lane by the oaktrees, goatherd, and thou wilt find a new-carved image of figwood; the bark is still on it, and it has neither legs nor ears but is equipped with procreant member to do the works of Cyprus....

or Dioscorides 1 GP (= AP 5.56 = 1 Galán Vioque), ἐκμαίνει χεῖλη μερόδοχροα, ποικιλόμυθα, ... καὶ μαζοὶ γλαγόνεντες ἐύζυγες ἱμερόεντες / εὐφυνέες... ("They drive me mad, those rosy prattling lips, ... and those milky breasts well-mated, full of charm, fairly formed..."). Nevertheless, these two epigrams do not tax the average reader—ἀρτιγλυφής and ἀνούατος only here, αὐτόφλοιος elsewhere only in [Theocritus] 25.208 and Philip 15.1 GP *Garland* (= AP 6.99.1), ποικιλόμυθος and perhaps γλαγόεις not attested before, but none of them unclear in meaning. Real troubles arise when ecphrastic attitude meets technical language: i.e., with dedicatory epigrams purportedly written by fishermen, spinners, schoolmasters and other humble workers. Hellenistic authors began quite early to pay attention to the themes and language of Attic comedy,¹⁸ and more generally to low-class characters whose votive offerings are the best chance to exploit a treasure of words usually missing from high poetry. Such offerings, it is worth stressing, are described in a wholly different way from how their ostensible dedicants would have done. This trend apparently begins with Leonidas of Tarentum and resumes somewhat later with Pha(i)nias. Leonidas' chronology is uncertain. Some scholars place him at the beginning of the Hellenistic age, others around the middle of the third century; his abstruse style might suggest not too early a date, but such clues are far from decisive.¹⁹ Be this as it may, votive poems full of both technical terms and

¹⁸ Cf. Asclepiades' instructions to the servants (25–6 GP = AP 5.181 and 185 = 25–6 Guichard) or Posidippus' ludicrous epitaph for the parasite Phylomachus (121 AB = Athen. 10.414d = 16 GP). The latter may seem a bit *recherché*, but apart from the textual problem at the beginning of line 7, on which see Austin (2002: 10–2), it in fact contains just two *hapax legomena*, παννυχικός and μονολήκυθος, both far from unclear. On comic language in Asclepiades see Guichard (2004: 111–2).

¹⁹ The earlier date is defended, among others, by Gigante (1971: 37–42) and Gutzwiller (1998b: 88–9); Gow (1958b: 113–7) and Gow-Page (1965: 2.308 and 311–2) held the opposite view. For a (commendably) cautious re-examination of the evidence see De Stefani (2005: 179–84).

cryptic epithets appear to be his speciality;²⁰ his language is affected in epitaphs as well, but not to such a degree. Teleson's dedication to Pan (Leonidas 47 GP = AP 6.35) runs as follows:

τοῦτο χιμαιροβάτα Τελέσων αἰγώνυχι Πανὶ
 τὸ σκύλος ἀγρείας τεῖνε κατὰ πλατάνου,
 καὶ τὰν ραιβόκρανον εὐστόρθυγγα κορύναν,
 ᾧ πάρος αἰμωποὺς ἐστυφέλιξε λύκους,
 γαυλούς τε γλαγοπήγας ἀγωγαῖόν τε κυνάγχαν
 καὶ τὰν εὐρίνων λαιμοπέδαν σκυλάκων.

This skin did Teleson stretch on the woodland plane-tree, an offering to goat-hoofed Pan the goat-treader, and the crutched, well-pointed staff, with which he used to bring down red-eyed wolves, the cheese-pails, too, and the leash and collars of his keen-scented hounds.

Five *hapax legomena* and three words unattested before, all in just six lines. Among them, *λαιμοπέδη* (later only in Antipater of Thessalonica 54.8 GP *Garland* (= AP 6.109.8) and Archias 4.4 GP *Garland* (= AP 6.16.4)) may well be a true technical term: but *χιμαιροβάτης*, *αἰγώνυξ*, *ραιβόκρανος*, *εὐστόρθυγξ* (later only in Crinagoras 42.7 GP *Garland* (= AP 6.232.7)), *γλαγοπήξ*, and *ἀγωγαῖος* appear to be nothing but contrived neologisms, probably coined by Leonidas himself.²¹ Other technical words, like *γαυλός* or *κυνάγχη*, unpoetical as they may be, are not unattested by Leonidas' time. This is revealing of his aims. Technical language is nothing but a pretext to exert his own lexical creativity and challenge the reader's competence.²²

It is easy to understand that such a trend could quickly spread beyond dedicatory epigram. In the next century, in fact, although only two of Antipater of Sidon's (ca. 180–100 B.C.) many dedicatory poems are in true Leonidean manner,²³ Antipater extends the use of

²⁰ Cf. 2, 7, 8, 35, 36, 41, 42, 47, 52, and 56 GP; 20 GP (= AP 7.295), the epitaph of a fisherman, shows the same features. The best analysis of Leonidas' style and language is De Stefani (2005: 162–73).

²¹ Perhaps not *αἰμωπός*, which will appear with some frequency in later prose.

²² A different opinion is held by Gigante (1971) and now by Gutzwiller (1998b: 94), according to whom the language of Leonidas' poems on poor men and women "should not be viewed as merely rhetorical, decoration without regard to content, but rather as a means to shake the reader's complacent disregard for such marginal creatures." *Contra*, Degani (1993: 209).

²³ 4 GP (= AP 6.160); Antipater of Thessalonica 54 GP *Garland* (= AP 6.109). The latter was once (doubtfully) ascribed to the younger Antipater by Gow-Page (1968: 2.63), but most likely belongs to the Sidonian: cf. Page (1975: 240) and Argentieri (2003: 44–6).

recherché vocabulary to epitaph, whether a peasant's (22 GP = AP 7.172) or Anacreon's (16 GP = AP 7.29), or the female philosopher Hipparchia's (67 GP = AP 7.413). Rare words, redundant epithets and sequences of almost equivalent conceits become the hallmark of the new style; many scholars rightly label it as "baroque."²⁴ By Meleager's time some decades later, the evolution is completed. In roughly 800 surely Meleagrian lines, 81 words appear for the first time (41 *hapax legomena* and 40 reappearing only later),²⁵ 55 of which are adjectives. In Meleager, largely a homo- and hetero-erotic poet, lexical complexity has spread over all topics, including those traditionally not prone to it. And it appears not to aim at challenging the reader's erudition and interpretative skill, but only at embellishing—in the poet's view—standard themes with trendy "baroque" diction. Obscurity is no longer the issue. Leonidas is sometimes hard to understand; Meleager is not, and clearly does not want to be.

Such an evolution is by no means confined to books. There is no room here for analyzing the style of inscriptional epigrams, but a quick survey of the standard collections can show that poems on stone, in both the Hellenistic age and the first Imperial period, very often follow

²⁴ On Antipater's style see Argentieri (2003: 62–7).

²⁵ Radinger (1895: 66–9) lists 106 words either attested in Meleager only or unattested before him. From his list we should remove the following ones: αἰλαλος (Callimachus 37.3 GP = AP 7.459.3 = 16.3 Pf., unless we read αἰεὶ ἄλalon; Antipater of Sidon 27.3 GP = AP 7.353.3), αἰπολικός (Callimachus fr. 689 Pf.; Theocritus 1.56; Posidippus 19.8 AB), ἄλλαγμα ('Hr.' VM 3.5, pre-Hellenistic), βαρυπενθής (Pi. fr. 169b.6 Maehler; B. 14.12; [Orph.] fr. 488.5 Bernabé), δεινρόδης (Thpr. HP 1.3.4, 6.7.3; Lyc. 830), κεραυνοβόλος (E. Ba. 598), μελαμπέταλος (anon. SH 991.1, 3rd c.; [Ion] FGE 1.1 = AP 7.43.1 = fr. ***138.1 Leurini, with Lobeck's emendation), ὀξύτορος (v. l. at S. Ant. 108, preferred by most recent editors), ὀπισθοβάτης (E. fr. **954a.2 Kannicht, though in a different meaning), ὀρθροβόας (perhaps Alexarchus *ap.* Heracl. Lemb. fr. 5: see, however, Bonaccini-Magnelli (1998: 67–8)), πολύπαις (Philoch. FGrH 328 F 90, if the word belongs to him), φιλόκωμος ("Simonides" 66.5 FGE = AP 7.24.5, probably Hellenistic), φίλοιμβρος (cf. φιλόμβριος "Plato" 21.1 FGE = AP 6.43.1). I also exclude words attested in the *Septuaginta*, which may or may not be older than Meleager (ἐντρομος, εὐλαλος, πανόδυτος, περισκυθίζω, σάββας, συντροχάζω), and those already existing as proper names (δυσνίκητος, φάνιον), plus ἐφαρπάζω at 114.6 GP = AP 12.84.6 (where most editors retain the transmitted ἀφ-), ὀρκούρος at 129.2 GP = AP 12.257.2 (ἐρκ- Salmassius, rightly), προφασίη (nowhere in our text) and the last word of 50.3 GP = AP 5.163.3 (text most uncertain: see Burzacchini (1986: 579–80)). For ψυχροπότης read ψυχαπάτης (3 times; elsewhere only in a probably spurious addition to Eratosthenes fr. 36 Powell). The following words, marked by Radinger as *hapax legomena*, are in fact attested in later Greek: αἱματόφυτος, δυσέραστος, λευκοπάρειος, μελίστακτος, νεόγραφος, οἰνοβρεχής, πελαγίτις, προσπιθυρίζω, σηκπροφόρος/-φορέω, συμπαίκτης, ὑφαγημών, φαρετροφόρος.

the trends of top-notch literature. Scholars have seen that the catalogue of Halicarnassian writers in the inscribed poem known as “The Pride of Halicarnassus” (*SGO* 01/12/02) owes much in style and structure to Meleager’s proem to his *Garland* (1 GP = *AP* 4.1).²⁶ The same holds true for the best preserved passage of Pomptilla’s long epitaph from Carales, written in the first or second century A.D. (*GVI* 2005.33–7):²⁷

εἰς ἴα σου, Πώμπτιλλα, καὶ [ἐ]ς κρίνα βλαστήσειεν
 ὅστέα, κα[ὶ] θ[ι]ά<λ>λο[ι]ς ἐν πετάλοισι ρόδων
 ἡδυπνόου [τ]ε κρόκου καὶ ἀγηράτου ἀμαράντου,
 κεῖς καλὰ βλαστήσῃς ἄνθεα λευκοίου....

In violets and lilies, Pomptilla, may your bones bloom,
 and may you flourish with petals of rose
 and of fragrant saffron and the ageless never-fading flower,
 and in beautiful flowers of snowdrop may you bloom, etc.

These charming lines are not a mere touch of romanticism, but echo the similar lists of flowers in Meleager 46 GP (= *AP* 5.147) πλέξω λευκόιον, πλέξω δ’ ἀπαλὴν ἄμα μύρτοις / νάρκισσον (“I will plait in white violets and tender narcissus mid myrtle berries”) and Rufinus 28 Page (= *AP* 5.74) πέμπω σοί, Ῥοδόκλεια, τόδε στέφος... ἔστι κρίνον ροδέη τε κάλυξ νοτερή τ’ ἀνεμώνη (“I send you this garland, Rhodocleia... there are lilies and roses and dewy anemones”). The grief of Pomptilla’s relatives has taken a highly stylized literary shape, and its versifier, apart from the possible slip in prosody at line 36, was a well-read one.

The Age of Mannerism, Down to Philip

After Meleager, Greek epigram proceeds towards standardization. Within Philip’s *Garland* there are indeed some differences between one poet and another, but they hardly seem striking, as sometimes in Meleager’s collection. By far the most gifted and enjoyable author is Philodemus, who carries on the tradition of erotic epigram, wittily exploiting Meleager’s legacy and occasionally taking it in new directions.²⁸ Other original writers are Argentarius and Crinagoras, though neither can

²⁶ Cf. Lloyd-Jones (1999), with detailed commentary, and D’Alessio (2004).

²⁷ Newly re-edited by Cugusi (2003: 63–7, 105–38).

²⁸ Sider (1997: 24–39) is pivotal on this topic; some further remarks in Magnelli (1994).

rival Philodemus' lively elegance. For the rest, the dominant trend is the variation on commonplace topics through unexpected neologisms and affected style. This does not mean that most of Philip's contributors should be labeled as poetasters: they are skillful and competent versifiers, who clearly followed this fashion by choice.

Such mannerism is partly responsible for the decline in amatory themes and the increase of dedicatory and, foremost, epideictic epigrams; epitaphs continue to be written, but they often shift towards the paradoxical; and it comes as no surprise that Leonidas exerted a strong influence on some of these poets, like Philip, Bianor, and Antiphilus.²⁹ Philip's proem (1 *GP Garland* = *AP* 4.2) is revealing of what the second *Garland* will contain:

ἄνθεά σοι δρέψας Ἑλικώνια καὶ κλυτοδένδρου
 Πιερίης κείρας πρωτοφύτους κάλυκας
 καὶ σελίδος νεαρῆς θερίσας στάχυν, ἀντανέπλεξα
 τοῖς Μελεαγρείοις ὥς ἵκελον στεφάνοις.
 ἀλλὰ παλαιότερων εἰδὼς κλέος, ἐσθλὲ Κάμιλλε,
 γνῶθι καὶ ὀπλοτέρων τὴν ὀλιγοστιχίην.
 Ἀντίπατρος πρέψει στεφάνῳ στάχυν, ὥς δὲ κόρυμβος
 Κριναγόρας, λάμπει δ' ὥς βότρυν Ἀντίφιλος,
 Τύλλιος ὥς μελίλωτον, ἀμάρακον ὥς Φιλόδημος,
 μύρτα δ' ὁ Παρμενίων, ὥς ρόδον Ἀντιφάνης,
 κισσὸς δ' Αὐτομέδων, Ζωνᾶς κρίνα, δρῦς δὲ Βιάνωρ,
 Ἀντίγονος δ' ἐλάη καὶ Διόδωρος Ἷον.
 Εὐήνῳ δάφνην συνεπύπλεκε· τοὺς δὲ περισσοὺς
 εἴκασον οἷς ἐθέλεις ἄνθεσιν ἄρτιφύτοις.

Plucking flowers of Helicon for you, and cutting first-born blooms from Pieria's famous forest, reaping a harvest from recent pages, I in my turn have woven a garland like Meleager's. You know the fame of older poets, noble Camillus; learn also the brief poems of later men. Antipater will adorn the wreath as a head of corn, Crinagoras like ivy-berries; Antiphilus will be bright as a grape-cluster, Tullius like melilot, Philodemus like marjoram, Parmenion myrtle, Antiphanes like a rose. Automedon is ivy, Zonas lilies, Bianor the oak-leaf, Antigonos the olive and Diodorus the violet. Weave bay in for Euenus, and liken the rest to what fresh-born flowers you will.

²⁹ A "baneful influence," according to Gow-Page (1968: 1.xxxiv); cf. the similar judgment by Griffiths (1970a: 216). Gutzwiller (1998b: 114) has a different theory on Leonidas' reception. Philip is most fond of abstruse dedicatory poems in the Leonidean manner (7, 8, 11–4, 16–22 *GP Garland*).

I have argued elsewhere that this proem articulates a true literary program³⁰ defending ὀλιγοστιχίη (brevity) as a basic principle of late Hellenistic epigram³¹ and at the same time carrying it into effect. Meleager's own proem (1 GP = AP 4.1) starts with a straightforward question to the Muse, who immediately answers listing no less than 47 authors included in the anthology.³² Philip, on the contrary, after a mannered and magniloquent introduction³³ contents himself with just 13 names: his list is most concise, with no epithet at all, and finally ends with a sort of *Abbruchsformel* asking the reader to supply the information that the writer has left aside.³⁴ It is not by chance that "the rest" (14) is expressed by περισσός, which also conveys the meaning of "redundant" or "excessive": listing all the περισσοί (the remaining poets) would make the proem itself περισσόν (too long).³⁵ So the first epigram of the collection embodies the main features of the others—elaborate style in a small form.

Dialect is another gauge of standardization. Several authors from Asclepiades down to Meleager are credited with epigrams written in (Epic-)Ionic dialect and others written in a light version of Doric: there also are many poems featuring a mixture of both dialects. The latter fact may be due partly to the intervention of medieval scribes,³⁶ but the "New Posidippus" has definitely shown that a fair number of Doric forms, either pervasive or incidental, are to be traced back to the poet himself. Be this a stylized form of realism, a mark of affiliation with certain literary traditions or, in court poems, an allusion to the supposed Dorian ancestry of the Ptolemies,³⁷ it is clearly intentional. All in all,

³⁰ Magnelli (2006).

³¹ Meleagrian poets often allow themselves considerable length, while Philippan epigrams seldom exceed four couplets. Data are collected by Gow-Page (1968: l.xxxvii).

³² "To whom, dear Muse, do you bring these varied fruits of song, or who was it who wrought this garland of poets?" "The work was Meleager's, and he laboured thereat to give it as a keepsake to glorious Diocles. Many lilies of Anyte he inwove, and many of Moero, etc."

³³ Κλυτόδενδρος and ἀνταναπλέω here only; πρωτόφυτος will not reappear until Byzantine times.

³⁴ Cf. Callimachus SH 264.1 αὐτὸς ἐπιφράσσαιτο, τάμοι δ' ἄπο μήκος ἀοιδῆ, ("[other details] let him find out on his own, and save my song some length"). See Bing (1995b: 124–5).

³⁵ Magnelli (2006: 399–400).

³⁶ The problem is aptly summarized by Gow-Page (1965: l.xlv–vii).

³⁷ Scholars disagree on this point. Sens (2004) is the most thorough study; the "Ptolemaic" view is maintained by Bettarini (2005: 15–22). Cf. also Palumbo Stracca (1993–4) and (2003); Bastianini-Gallazzi (2001: 21–2); Sens (2005b); Guichard (2005).

during the third and second centuries inconsistency in dialect appears to be a distinguishing mark of epigram as a genre.³⁸ Things change by Philip's times. The great majority of epigrams are now written in standard literary Ionic; single "Doric" words still appear here and there, but overall Doric coloring becomes infrequent. Antipater of Thessalonica has three "Doric" epigrams out of 29; Antiphilus, nine out of 51; Philip, roughly four out of 80; Philodemus, one out of 29; Argentarius, one out of 37; Crinagoras, none out of 51. And many of these are either Spartan anecdotes or dedications in the Leonidean manner.

Epigrammatists of this age—notably those of Macedonian origin, i.e., Antipater of Thessalonica, Philip himself, and perhaps Antiphanes—show a strong distaste for Alexandrian refinement and a marked preference for older poets. Antipater explicitly asserts his enthusiastic addiction to "manly Homer" (20 GP *Garland* = *AP* 11.20):³⁹

φεύγεθ', ὅσοι λόκκας ἢ λοφνίδας ἢ καμασῆνας
 ἄδετε, ποιητῶν φῦλλον ἀκανθολόγων,
 οἳ τ' ἐπέων κόσμον λελυγισμένον ἀσκήσαντες
 κρήνης ἐξ ἱερῆς πίνετε λιτὸν ὕδωρ.
 σήμερον Ἀρχιλόχοιο καὶ ἄρσενος ἡμᾶρ Ὀμήρου
 σπένδομεν· ὁ κρητὴρ οὐ δέχεθ' ὕδροπότας.

Away with you, all who sing of "loccae" and "lophnides" and "camasenes", tribe of thorn-gathering poets, and you who drink frugal water from the holy spring, practising contortions as your verses' ornament. Today we pour wine for the birthday of Archilochus and manly Homer; our bowl is not at home to water-drinkers.

Are we to trust Antipater? Only to a certain extent, I think. Undoubtedly these poets are un-Callimachean; this does not imply that they are "Homeric"—on the contrary, they could hardly be more distant from the language and style of epic poetry. They purport to worship Archilochus and Homer, but do not follow them at all. Allegiance to the dominant trends in post-Meleagrian epigram was a one-way ticket: nobody could really think of writing dedicatory and epideictic poems in a simple, archaizing, pre-Alexandrian form. New ways required (partly) new subjects. This begins to take place in that same Neronian age, but

³⁸ As Palumbo Stracca (1987: 429–30) rightly remarks.

³⁹ Cf. also Philip 60 and 61 GP *Garland* (= *AP* 11.321 and 347); Antiphanes 9 GP *Garland* (= *AP* 11.322). Crinagoras (11 GP *Garland* = *AP* 9.545) held a very different opinion on Callimachus' *Hecale*.

outside the *Garland* of Philip, when Lucillius and others expand the skoptic tradition;⁴⁰ shortly thereafter Strato of Sardis will renew amatory epigram by transferring heterosexual themes into a homosexual context. But this is another story.

Meter: Between Alexandrianism and (Apparent) Carelessness

Several poets of Meleager's *Garland*—notably Callimachus and “Theocritus”, whatever the latter name means—occasionally write in non-elegiac meters, both stichic and epodic; Philippan authors take up the trend, though to a lesser degree.⁴¹ Philip's extensive use of iambic trimeter is just another sign of his fondness for Leonidas, yet he even goes so far as to compose an epigram in five stichic pentameters progressively suffering contraction—i.e. becoming more spondaic—in both hemistichs (62 GP *Garland* = AP 13.1). But the vast majority of our poems are in elegiac couplets. A comprehensive study is needed: here I will just focus on the most telling facts in a diachronical perspective.

The “outer metric” (dactyls and spondees) of both Meleagrian and Philippan epigrams is quite predictable: hexameters are on the whole more dactylic than before, spondees are most often placed in the first two feet, and a spondaic fifth foot is usually avoided.⁴² As for the “inner metric” (word boundaries, pauses, and bridges), feminine caesura tends to be preferred, while verses without third-foot caesura are extremely rare.⁴³ Apart from such basic features, it is widely assumed that versification of the hexameter line in an elegiac couplet is stricter than in stichic hexameters, and this holds true for many epigrammatists—but not for all. It is widely known that in the Hellenistic age the main difference between the refined, “modern” poets and the conservative ones lies in their greater or lesser allegiance to a number of rhythmical principles, once labeled as

⁴⁰ See Nisbet (2003a) and his chapter on satiric epigram in this volume.

⁴¹ For a survey, Gow-Page (1968: 1.xxxvii–viii).

⁴² Much evidence is available in Brioso Sánchez (1978); cf. also Fantuzzi (2002: 79–82) and Guichard (2004: 124–6). On spondaic lines see Gow-Page (1968: 1.xliv with n. 4).

⁴³ Hedylus 10.9 GP (= Athen. 4.176c) and Theaetetus 6.1 GP (= D. L. 8.48) are perhaps the most striking exceptions. For other Hellenistic instances cf. West (1982: 157). Posidippus 18.5 AB does not belong to this group: see Fantuzzi (2002: 89–90) with Bing (2005: 136).

“laws,” which had their fullest embodiment in Callimachus’ hexameters. The most relevant “laws” can be summarized as follows:⁴⁴

- (i) Meyer’s First Law: words of the shape $\times - \cup$ should not end in the second foot.
- (ii) Meyer’s Second Law: iambic words rarely stand before masculine caesura.
- (iii) Simultaneous violation of both Meyer’s First and Second Law is mostly avoided.
- (iv) Giseke’s Law: words of the shape $\times - \overline{\cup\cup}$ should not end with the second foot.
- (v) Hilberg’s Law: word-break after a spondaic second foot is avoided.
- (vi) Simultaneous violation of both Giseke’s and Hilberg’s Laws is mostly avoided.
- (vii) A contracted third biceps requires bucolic caesura.
- (viii) Hermann’s Bridge: word-break after the fourth trochee is strictly avoided.
- (ix) Naeke’s Law: word-break after a spondaic fourth foot is avoided.
- (x) Tiedke-Meyer’s Law: words of the shape $--$ or $\cup\cup-$ rarely end in the fifth longum.

Let us see what happens with epigram.⁴⁵ The following table collects the evidence for the non-observance of these “laws” among major poets down to Meleager:⁴⁶

⁴⁴ This is just a skeletal list. More detailed definitions of each “law” can be found, e.g., in Mineur (1984: 38–40) and Hollis (1990: 19–21).

⁴⁵ A full discussion of all the available material, including minor details and comparative data, would exceed the limits of this paper; the reader will find it in a further study of mine, which I hope will appear quite soon. There I also deal with the law discovered by Bulloch (1970), which requires a more circumstantial treatment.

⁴⁶ Percentages are in italics. All figures derive from fresh scrutiny of my own; obviously I have checked them against recent studies. Asclepiades’ versification is dealt with by Guichard (2004: 113–33); Posidippus’ by Fantuzzi (2002); Dioscorides’ by Galán Vioque (2001: 30–4); Leonidas’ by De Stefani (2005: 147–62); Philodemus’ by Sider (1997: 41–4); that of the two Antipatri by Argentieri (2003: 50–9). Interesting remarks may still be found in older works, like Ouvre (1894b: 87–117) and Knauer (1935: 62–5) on Asclepiades and Posidippus, Geffcken (1897: 141–4) and Hansen (1914: 25–9) on Leonidas, Moll (1920: 45–69) on Dioscorides, Waltz (1906: 87–99) on Antipater of Sidon, Dittmar (1886) and Ouvre (1894a: 207–33) on Meleager, Rubensohn (1888: 28–45) on Crinagoras, Müller (1935: 22–7) on Antiphilus, and so on; but their data concerning inner metrics are useless as far as they do not take into account the appositives.

	ll.	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)	(v)	(vi)	(vii)	(viii)	(ix)	(x)
Anyte	40	2 5.0	—	—	1 2.5	—	1 2.5	—	—	—	2 5.0
Ascl.	75	5 6.7	3 4.0	3 4.0	—	—	1 1.3	1 1.3	—	1 1.3	—
Posid.	old: 66	3 4.5	—	1 1.5	—	—	—	2 3.0	—	—	2 3.0
	new: 229	10 4.4	3 1.3	6 2.6	9 3.9	5 2.2	6 2.6	12 5.2	1 0.4	—	5 2.2
Call.	139	—	1 0.7	—	—	2 1.4	1 0.7	—	—	—	—
‘Theoc.’	48	3 6.2	2 4.2	2 4.2	1 2.1	—	—	1 2.1	1 2.1	1 2.1	2 4.2
Leon. ⁴⁷	a: 102	3 2.9	1 0.9	2 1.9	—	2 1.9	1 0.9	1 0.9	—	—	—
	b: 171	1 0.6	2 1.2	2 1.2	1 0.6	1 0.6	6 3.5	1 0.6	—	1 0.6	1 0.6
Diosc.	119	5 4.2	1 0.8	1 0.8	1 0.8	—	2 1.7	—	—	—	1 0.8
Alc. Mess.	68	2 2.9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Antip. Sid.	a: 154	3 1.9	1 0.6	—	1 0.6	1 0.6	—	—	—	—	—
	b: 148	1 0.7	—	—	—	1 0.7	1 0.7	4 2.7	—	—	—
Mel.	402	10 2.5	13 3.2	10 2.5	5 1.2	7 1.7	3 0.7	20 5.0	4 1.0	1 0.2	12 3.0

These figures are too small to have any statistical relevance separately, but the overall picture is quite clear. Callimachus once more proves himself the most fastidious, while other poets, notably his near-contemporaries (and alleged literary enemies) Asclepiades and Posidippus, do not fully share his metrical refinement. By the second century B.C., however, versification tends to become stricter. Authors like Alcaeus of Messene and Antipater of Sidon possibly exhibit Alexandrian (“Callimachean”) influence⁴⁸—this is quite likely for Antipater, whose epigrams feature several echoes of Callimachus’ poetry. After that, Meleager’s apparent carelessness is all the more striking. Not even Hermann’s Bridge, the Greek hexameter’s most stringent rule, is rigorously upheld

⁴⁷ With regard to Leonidas, Antipater of Sidon and (in the following table) Antipater of Thessalonica, (a) refers to the epigrams of undisputed authorship, (b) to the *dubia*. For the two Antipaters, I rely on Argentieri (2003: 222).

⁴⁸ To a certain degree this happens with inscribed Hellenistic epigrams as well: see Fantuzzi and Sens (2006).

in his epigrams: he offends against it no less than four times, though not very blatantly.⁴⁹ How are we to explain this? Meleager is a most skilful writer; he is fond, as we have seen above, of unusual words and affected neologisms; his verses run smooth, his prosody is even stricter than that of his predecessors.⁵⁰ His “liberties” are hardly due to negligence: they rather forebode, in my view, a new conception of where metrical refinement could lie. Here are the data for the major Philippan poets:

	ll.	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)	(v)	(vi)	(vii)	(viii)	(ix)	(x)
Antip. Th.	a: 82	5 6.1	1 1.2	1 1.2	—	—	—	—	—	1 1.2	—
	b: 166	6 3.6	1 0.6	3 1.8	—	1 0.6	—	—	—	—	—
Antiphil.	152	2 1.3	—	1 0.6	—	1 0.6	2 1.3	—	—	—	—
Apollon.	78	—	1 1.3	2 2.6	2 2.6	—	—	2 2.6	—	—	1 1.3
Argent.	100	2 2.0	3 3.0	—	2 2.0	1 1.0	1 1.0	2 2.0	—	—	—
Bianor	57	8 14.0	1 1.7	1 1.7	1 1.7	—	—	—	—	—	—
Crinag.	132	2 1.5	1 0.7	—	1 0.7	1 0.7	1 0.7	5 3.8	1 0.7	—	47 0.7
Erucius	45	1 2.2	—	—	2 4.4	—	—	—	—	—	—
Phil.	202	6 3.0	2 1.0	6 3.0	1 0.5	—	—	15 7.4	2 1.0	—	6 3.0
Philod.	93	4 4.3	1 1.1	6 6.4	—	1 1.1	—	2 2.1	2 2.1	—	1 1.1

Most of them appear to be much looser than Callimachus or Antipater of Sidon; Philip and Philodemus (himself a very elegant poet) are close to Meleager’s standards. On the other hand, in all these authors (apart from Crinagoras) prosody is still stricter: elision, *correptio epica*, and lengthening by movable -v become very infrequent, and accented

⁴⁹ 26.1 GP (= AP 5.160.1) is the most relevant instance: in 72.3 GP (= AP 5.184.3) the emphatic tone may account for the offence, 102.3 GP (= AP 12.70.3) is mitigated by elision. In 128.5 GP (= AP 134.5) we cannot rule out the possibility that Meleager regarded τί as prepositional.

⁵⁰ On the last point see Page (1963); West (1982: 158–9).

pentameter-ends are avoided.⁵¹ Here too, I do not think that real carelessness is the issue. Hexameter was changing, and the ground was shifting from “inner metric” to prosodic and accentual rules. Not every author of the second *Garland* shared Philip’s or Antipater’s distaste for Alexandrian poetry,⁵² but neither did they closely follow Alexandrian trends in verse-making.⁵³

⁵¹ See Gow-Page (1968: 1.xxxviii–xlv); Page (1978: 28–39); West (1982: 158–9, 181–2).

⁵² See above, n. 39.

⁵³ In the field of stichic hexameter, it is remarkable that no Imperial poet before Nonnus fully shares Callimachus’ strictness—not even those with a strong bent for Callimachean diction, like Dionysius Periegetes.

PART TWO

POETICS

THE ACT OF READING AND THE ACT OF WRITING IN HELLENISTIC EPIGRAM*

Doris Meyer

In the Hellenistic age great libraries sprang up accompanied by an unprecedented spread of poetry books, and a new literary culture emerged in the great *metropoleis* of the Hellenistic kingdoms, generating new products, attitudes and approaches, though always with reference to the Greek past.¹ The intensive study of contemporary and past authors was a typical feature of the age, and every serious author was conscious of having to face a public as well read as himself—or at least he supposed it to be. In addition to the specialized audience of the royal courts, there was a larger public of studious readers who influenced the character of literary production, as papyri have shown.²

The *GA* itself is an example of the dynamics which grew from the diffusion of a culture of reading. The interaction of authors and readers evolved into a “communication” across the times, a dialogue in which authors and readers played different parts: poets enact themselves as readers and let their own reading experiences be reflected by their epigrams; collectors arrange epigrams for other readers; moreover, the genre of literary commentary develops, reflecting an interest in, and work on, the literary *œuvre* of other authors.³

Scholars have long studied the interplay of author and reader in ancient epigram, especially in seeking to explain an epigram’s point, its wit and typical play with readerly expectations. Eighteenth century

* I must thank Claude Calame and the participants of his seminar where I first presented this paper, in January 2005 in Paris. I have profited greatly from their suggestions.

¹ For the Hellenistic culture of reading see, e.g., Bing (1988b), Chartier and Cavallo (1999: 24–6), Hunter (2003: 213–35), Thompson (1994: 67–83), and Harris (1989: 116–45).

² Asper (2001: 84–116), Parsons (2002: 99–136). Since this is not the place to give a complete list of all the recent studies following the publication of the Posidippus papyrus, we cite only Acosta Hughes, Kosmetatou and Baumbach (2004) and Gutzwiller (2005c).

³ Gutzwiller (1998b), Argentieri (1998: 1–20). See also Cameron (1993: 370) on the commentary Hedylus, an author of epigrams himself, may have written on the epigrams of Callimachus.

German theorists of epigram considered these features essential for the genre.⁴ Since the end of the nineteenth century the historical value of epigrams came to play a greater role in scholarly discussion. While searching for reliable criteria for a distinction between historical verse inscriptions and fictive epigrams in the literary tradition, scholars came to see the relevance of the act of reading: what additional information did fictive inscriptions have to supply a reader of a book so that he might understand it without the context of a monument?⁵ The focus on reception (which is traditional in classics insofar as epigram is concerned) has recently been put on new methodological footing through reader-response criticism (*literarische Rezeptionsästhetik*).⁶ This critical approach emerged by the end of the 1960s in German and English literary studies. Unlike the empirical or historical approach to reader-response, which studies concrete behaviours of groups or individuals, literary reader-response criticism examines the readers in the text.⁷ Jean-Paul Sartre, cited by Wolfgang Iser at the beginning of his discussion of “grasping a text,” expressed the idea as follows:

When a work is produced, the creative act is only an incomplete, abstract impulse; if the author existed all on his own, he could write as much as he liked, but his work would never see the light of the day as an object, and he would have to lay down his pen in despair. The process of writing, however, includes as a dialectic correlative the process of reading, and these two interdependent acts require two different active people. The combined efforts of author and reader bring into being the concrete and imaginary object which is the work of mind. Art exists only for and through other people.⁸

⁴ Peek (1960: 1–5), Lausberg (1982: 78–87), Meyer (2005: 31–2). See also Köhnken (1973: 425–41) and Laurens (1989).

⁵ Weber (1917: 536–57), cited by Rösler (1983: 7–28, esp. 27). Even if Weber could point out some important features of literary epigram, the question he tries to answer, “*Steinepigramm oder Buchepigramm?*” seems obsolete today, as there it is not the medium which constitutes the difference between literary and non-literary epigrams. In Hellenistic times, poets well experienced in other literary genres composed epigrams for both stones and books, on which see, for example, Bing (1998).

⁶ Meyer (1993), Bing (1995b), Schmitz (1999), Zanker (2004: 80–83, 109–12), Gutzwiller (1998b: 8).

⁷ Suleiman and Crosman (1980), Nünning (2004: 229–35), Miall (2003: 321–55), Meyer (2005: 10–2). For a historico-sociologic approach see, e.g., Robine (1970) and Messerli (2003).

⁸ Sartre, “Qu’est-ce que la littérature?” as cited by Iser (1978: 108). Iser develops his ideas upon the model of the speech act theory, an approach which considers language as the inseparable unity of speaking and hearing, or rather of writing and understanding, see Meyer (2005: 9).

The concerted effort of the poet in the act of composing or writing represents a concept which would have been quite familiar to Hellenistic poets. From the third century B.C. on, the theme of the poet's "labor" (πόνος) becomes characteristic. We find it in many epigrams of the *GA*, where poets focus on "selbstquälerische Disziplin und sprachliche Verantwortung des Dichters."⁹ These epigrams usually comment on the work of another poet, e.g., of Aratus, Creophylus, Anacreon or Meleager of Gadara.¹⁰ They pretend to be labels of poetry books given as presents, or part of a commentary addressed to a library visitor in search of "quick" information.

Although the theme of the poet's "labor" has its origins in early Greek poetry, its diffusion and emphasis in Hellenistic times betrays a new understanding of the act of producing poetry, one marked by the presence of a critical readership. Epigrammatists are now known by name and sign their epigrams. They thus take responsibility for the quality of their work, and compete for public commissions.¹¹ The effort of composing poetry, therefore, as Hellenistic poets understood it, was closely related to the labor of reading: the "work" of reading—not always easy in antiquity—was a part of the profession of being a poet; but it was also a practice appreciated by the educated public.

Recently, literary criticism and research on Hellenistic art have shared a common interest in reader—or viewer—response. Hellenistic epigrams in particular, when they are a "real" or imaginary inscription for a work of art, include not only the role of a reader but also that of a viewer in the text. Rhetorical *ekphrasis*, which typically transgresses different genres and media, is at the center of interest in recent research, and it is here that recipients come into play.¹²

⁹ For this "ponos-Konzept" in Callimachus, Theocritus and the poets of the *GA*, cf. Asper (1997: 98–9, 129–133; citation from 98, n. 326); Hunter (2003: 216). The efforts of thinking and composing poetry are also a theme in Hellenistic figurative art; see Zanker (1995: 90–141, esp. 133–9), for a sitting statue of Posidippus, whose portrait reflects the laborious and wearisome work of making poems.

¹⁰ Asclepiades 28 GP, Callimachus 56 GP (= 27 Pf.), 55 GP (= 6 Pf.), Antipater of Sidon 16 GP, Meleager 129 GP, Antipater of Thessalonica 85 GP *Garland* (= *AP* 9.792).

¹¹ Bing (1998) and (2005).

¹² von Hesberg (1988), Goldhill (1994), Gutzwiller (2002a), Zanker (2004), Gutzwiller (2004b), Kosmetatou (2004c), Papalexandrou (2004), Petrovic (2005). A comparable approach in Art History can be found in Kemp (1992) and Böhm (2003); and see Männlein-Robert in this volume.

The act of reading is itself a complex neuro-physiological operation of perception and reconstruction of sense, in which optical and verbal aspects take part.¹³ The interpretation of written characters is in some respects comparable to the interpretation—or “reading”—of a picture, and it is not surprising that readers of inscriptions and viewers of portraits in Hellenistic epigrams are represented analogously. As a matter of fact, some epigrams describe viewing, whereas reading, as a special case of the (typically epigrammatic) motif of viewing¹⁴ is always exceptional. To conceive of reading as a constructive and positive practice was apparently almost impossible in the archaic and classical periods, when literature was intended primarily for oral performance and face-to-face communication generally preferred to the exchange of written texts. The reader of that era appears as a curious intellectual, who may even become—just like the philosopher—a comic figure in popular art and literature.¹⁵ There appears to be a relationship between the official encouragement of intellectual culture in Hellenistic times and the broader public’s enhanced desire to participate in the related practices of reading and philosophizing.¹⁶

Hellenistic literary culture manifests itself not only in a reassessment of the act of creative writing but also in the poets’ conscious advertisement of themselves and their profession. Numerous signs also point to the fact that, simultaneous with the flourishing of literary culture, there was a quasi-philosophical reflection on the acts of reading and of written composition, focusing on a person’s inner workings in undertaking literary activity.¹⁷ Many such signs appear in Hellenistic epigram, a literary genre which offers us the opportunity to see ancient readers at work and to glance over their shoulder, as it were.

Fictive recipients (i.e., readers and viewers) and imaginary scenarios in which someone responds to a work of art or an inscription are already

¹³ See, e.g., Bußmann (1990: 446, *s.v.* “*Lesen*”). In many studies on literary reader response the visual aspect has long been neglected, see Esrock (1994), but also Calè (2004), and Murphy (2004); on the physical aspects of reading in antiquity in particular, see now Johnson (2000).

¹⁴ Meyer (2005: 66, n. 158).

¹⁵ See the comic position of a young man reading an inscription discussed by Svenbro (1988: 194–5) and Bing (2002).

¹⁶ Zanker (1995: 125–6, 186–8), Goldhill (1994: 207–10).

¹⁷ A comparable reflection marks the evolution of Hellenistic rhetoric; cf. Chartier and Cavallo (1999: 25): “Es ist kein Zufall, daß in hellenistischer Zeit... eine regelrechte Theorie des Lesens definiert wird.”

present in archaic Greek epigram. By dramatizing the “ideal” reception epigrams try to control the behavior of the anonymous passersby. The reader is still present in Hellenistic book epigrams, especially in funerary contexts. He is the “wanderer” or passerby who reads an epitaph and interprets a grave monument, in most cases a statue or portrait of the dead. This fictive reader allows historical and “actual” readers to identify. Nevertheless, in Greek inscriptional epigrams, the act of reading is not represented as reading as we know it today: it is not a solitary, quiet, and contemplative activity. On the contrary, the elaborate communication of a message to a readership is modelled throughout on oral speech acts. A large group of verse inscriptions, for example, uses direct speech to address the reader. The impression of personal contact between two persons, a speaker and a hearer, or sometimes several speakers, seems to be so important that even paradoxes such as dead speakers are accepted. Thus the epigrammatic speech act’s conceptual unity is preserved, although it is in reality “dissociated” from its addressee in time and space.¹⁸ These very inconsistencies were exploited by Hellenistic poets such as Callimachus so as to bring into play their favorite themes: problems of truth and falsehood, of credibility and illusion in poetic texts, are a question of literary quality for Callimachus.¹⁹

We must distinguish two types of “readers in the text,” if we wish to examine the act of reading in Hellenistic epigram: the “fictive reader” takes part in the fictive speech act, as a speaker or in a silent role. Each literary text also contains a response-inviting structure (*Wirkungsstruktur*) which guides and governs its readers. This structure—which is neither a role nor a character—is called by Wolfgang Iser the “implied reader” (*impliziter Leser*).²⁰ The two readers “in the text” are not identical with the external, historical readers—the intended readers—of epigram, but they can inform us about their attitudes and practices.²¹

¹⁸ Ehlich (1994: 18–23), Meyer (2005: 20–1).

¹⁹ Walsh (1991: 102).

²⁰ The different streams of reader response theory use different typologies of the reader; for the terminology and critique of the “implied reader” see Meyer (2005: 11–2), Richter (1996: 516–35, esp. 526–7), Nünning (2004: 145–6), and Shaffer and Brady (2004).

²¹ If the author aims at a certain reader (or a group of readers) exterior to the text who can be located historically, we should call him (them) intended reader(s), see Richter (1996: 526). In practice, there is a tendency to identify the implied reader with the intended reader.

In traditional epigrams, steles and statues often play the part of imaginary interlocutor for the reader. Hermes the messenger god is particularly suited to this role, as he is traditionally embodied in the form of a stone pillar: a Herm. Thus he actually is both a stele and a messenger. A statue base of the fourth century B.C., for example, belonging to a Herm, bears an inscription in which the god acts as the reader of a list of names, introducing himself and greeting his audience in iambic verses reminiscent of dramatic prologues.²² Apart from Hermes, this messenger *par excellence*, the inscribed letters themselves can sometimes assume the same role. Thus Herodotus describes the use of letters by analogy with oral communication, especially that of a messenger.²³ But when objects or letters speak metaphorically in the inscribed forerunners of Hellenistic epigrams, this means that a voice was actually heard. Reading aloud was the rule, and so we must imagine hearing a reader realize a text by lending his voice to the fictive speaker.²⁴ This apparent identification of inscribed object (or of the inscription itself) with the reader in the act of recitation appealed to Hellenistic poets who problematized it in their epigrams, using it as a spur for witty or quasi-philosophical reflections which became so typical of the genre.

In the Hellenistic and Roman Imperial periods readers continue to assume the role of the speaker in the miniature drama of a sepulchral epigram. For example, a second century A.D. verse inscription of Asia Minor decorating a little funerary altar with a sundial gives the following order:²⁵

²² CEG 861; see Meyer (2005: 103). Introducing a divine speaker lends special authority to the inscription, which describes a dedication with historical accuracy. But Hermes can also act on the stage of the theater. We have the comic dialogue with the Herm in Phrynichus' *Alcibiades* and the Herm's learned instructions in Callimachus *Iamb* 7. Cf. also the theater masks that are the speakers of Callimachus 26 GP (= 48 PF) and 27 (= 49 PF); and see Meyer (2005: 251–2) and Kassel (1983: 1–12); on masks, see also Fantuzzi in this volume.

²³ Hdt. 1.124.3, εὐρὼν δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ βυβλίον ἐνεὸν λαβὼν ἐπελέγετο. Τὰ δὲ γράμματα ἔλεγε τάδε, and 8.22.1–3, Θεμιστοκλέης ἐπορεύετο περὶ τὰ πότιμα ὕδατα, ἐντάμνων ἐν τοῖσι λίθοις γράμματα, τὰ Ἴωνες ἐπελθόντες τῇ ὕστεραίῃ ἡμέρῃ ἐπὶ τὸ Ἀρτεμίσιον ἐπελέξαντο. Τὰ δὲ γράμματα τάδε ἔλεγε. And see Meyer (2005: 39–43 and 43, n. 77). In Hdt. 5.35 a slave with a tattoo functions simultaneously as a living letter and a messenger.

²⁴ See the subtle analyses by Svenbro (1988) and Svenbro (1999: 59–96). For Herodotus, cf. also Meyer (2005: 43–5).

²⁵ Sillyon, A.D. 50–200, SGO 18/14/01; see Wiemer (1998: 149–52).

[[ὦ]ρας ἀθρή[[σ]ας καὶ τὸν τά|φον, ὦ ξένε, λέ[[ξ]ον·
μνησ|θείην αὖ ἢ [[Κιδ]ραμνου|γαμέτις.]

...after contemplating the hours and the grave, stranger, say: "I, the wife of Kidramyas, wish to be remembered, too."

The reader (man or woman) is asked to say aloud the epigram's essential information—the name and the origin of the dead—two elements that guarantee the continual remembrance of the deceased. In addition to this there is often a ritual greeting, by which every single visitor of the tomb is dismissed or takes his leave.²⁶ Conventionally this reader appears as an anonymous stranger—always from the point of view of the deceased—a role adoptable by every potential passerby able to read. In our example from Asia Minor he is invited to take over the part of the dead (woman) herself, an extraordinary request, as the editor of the epigram remarks,²⁷ for the logic of the situation leads us rather to expect the wanderer to remain "outside" the monument as a viewer or listener. Epigrammatists try to anticipate and guide the thoughts of their readers by putting themselves in the position of the viewer and drawing attention to the elements of the monument which can easily and intuitively be grasped, especially with regard to the object's beauty or utility. The combination of a practical and a commemorative function—grave altar and sundial in our case, funerary monument and road sign in many others—increases the probability that a passerby will take notice of the deceased's name.²⁸

Anticipation of what the reader will think is sometimes used by epigram poets to spectacular effect. Even if we (as the potential readers) are willing to play our traditional part of sympathizing questioner, a "speaking" monument may interrupt us almost brutally, as in the following fourth- or fifth-century A.D. inscription:

πρίν σε λέγειν· "ὦ τύμβε, τίς ἢ τίνος ἐνθάδε κείται;"
ἢ στήλῃ βοᾷα πᾶσι παρερχομένοις...

Before you say: "Oh grave, who?" or, "Whose child lies here?" the stele shouts to all who pass by:...

²⁶ χαῖρε marks the beginning and the end of the contact between the dead and the passerby; cf. also Sourvinou-Inwood (1995: 180–216).

²⁷ The explicit invitation addressed to the viewer to identify with the dead is rare if not unique in Greek epigram (Wiemer 1998: 152).

²⁸ Meyer (2005: 46–7, 55–6).

²⁹ Hermouthis, *GVI* 1635; and see Meyer (2005: 114, n. 330).

These two examples which ingeniously vary the classical role of the “wanderer” come from a period when literary epigram already exerted strong influence on its inscriptional counterpart and when even anonymous poets aimed for special effects on their stones. The dialogic *mise en scène* creates the illusion of proximity between the text’s commissioner and its reader, a feigned nearness that serves to guide the recipient as strictly as possible. In this way, the “speaking” object tries to dictate a particular response.³⁰

On the other hand, in the epigram accompanying the little grave altar (*SGO* 18/14/01) we see a recipient who has taken his time to contemplate the monument in silence. The epigram’s author takes it for granted that the viewer memorizes or even interprets the individual elements of the monument. Together, the act of viewing and that of reading generate understanding—a new and original theme in Hellenistic epigram. The fictive reader develops his thoughts in the form of a quasi-public dialogue with the object, interpreting the visible signs and images which lead him to comprehension.³¹ It is not surprising that in epigram, the psychology of the act of viewing is modelled upon the act of reading as a dialogue with “the self”:

Δίζημαι κατὰ θυμόν, ὅτου χάριν ἂ παροδίτις
 δισσάκι φεῖ μούνον γράμμα λέλογχε πέτρος
 λαοτύποις σμίλαις κεκολαμμένον. ἄρα γυναικί
 τᾷ χθονὶ κευθομένῃ Χιλιάς ἦν ὄνομα;
 τοῦτο γὰρ ἀγγέλλει κορυφούμενος εἰς ἓν ἀριθμός. 5
 ἢ τὸ μὲν εἰς ὀρθὰν ἀτραπὸν οὐκ ἔμολεν,
 δ’ οἰκτρὸν ναίουσα τόδ’ ἡρίον ἔπλετο Φειδῖς;
 νῦν Σφιγγὸς γρίφους Οἰδίπους ἐφρασάμαν.
 αἰνετὸς οὐκ δισσοῖο καμὼν αἴνιγμα τύποιο,
 φέγγος μὲν ξυνετοῖς, ἄξυνέτοις δ’ ἔρεβος. 10

I wonder to myself why this roadside marble
 has acquired two *phis* as its only inscription,
 engraved by stone-carving chisels. Was *Chilias* the name
 of the woman buried in earth here?

For this the letters summed up into one number announce:
 Or have we not travelled a straight path at all,

³⁰ To what degree ancient readers actually obeyed the dictates of the apparently speaking object is judged differently in recent research, on which see Bing (2002: 49) in his discussion of Svenbro (1988), Depew (1997), Day (1989) and Day (2000).

³¹ For the ancient analogy of seeing (and understanding) and reading see Goldhill (1994), Goldhill (2000) (on which, Bing (2002, 41–2, n. 4), and Gutzwiller (2002a).

and was the one who piteously inhabits this tomb called *Pheidis*?
 Now I Oedipus have pondered the riddles of the Sphinx.
 Praise to the one who invented the enigma of this double carving,
 a light to the intelligent but darkness to the unintelligent.
 (Alcaeus of Messene 16 GP (= AP 7.429); trans. Gutzwiller)

In Hellenistic epigram, the distinct mental operations of viewing and reading a monument are represented analogously and endowed with a positive value, as granting pleasure, if of a playful variety. That, at least, is what a literary epigram of Archias (or Lucianus) suggests, where the relation between work of art and viewer has a playful character. In this epigram, the anonymous speaker recommends to a shepherd a puzzling object named Echo, “image (or mirror) for every kind of voice.”³² In this case, there is no difference between viewing and hearing because there is no particular message to be conveyed, it is purely pleasure:

Ἠχὼ πετρήεσσαν ὀρέας, φίλε, Πανὸς ἐταίρην,
 ἀντίτυπον φθογγὴν ἔμπαλιν δομένην,
 παντοίων στομάτων ἄλλον εἰκόνα, ποιμέσιν ἡδὺ
 παίγνιον. ὅσσα λέγεις, ταῦτα κλύων ἄπιθι.

It's rocky Echo you see, my friend, Pan's companion,
 who sings back her responsive song,
 a speaking image for every kind of voice, the shepherd's
 sweet toy. Whatever you say, having heard that, depart.
 (Archias 33 GP (= AP 16.154), trans. Gutzwiller)

The shepherds can play with Echo because she does not discriminate between those who are well read or not. There is no message, no content, which an intellectual reader must interpret. The Echo in this poem is two different things at once: a statue which can be seen and a sound which can be heard. The poet plays with the two meanings and adds new sense to the traditional metaphor of the “speaking stone,” which is a mere convention in ancient epigram.³³ The evolution of that metaphor—which referred originally to the quasi-public recitation of the inscription in the act of reading—reveals the process of the privatization and the interiorization of reception in Hellenistic times. The purely private “use” of the image by the shepherds is a good example. They are fictive addressees partially controlled by the

³² Gutzwiller (2002a: 106) remarks that in this epigram *eikon* designates not only a statue but is very near to meaning of “image” or “mirror.”

³³ Meyer (2005: 18, 71–2).

speaker, but also free to use their voice, language, and even song in an independent and creative way.

The particular object a poet picks often constitutes the point in literary epigrams. In the fourteenth book of the *GA*, for instance, we find a mysterious poem, whose only theme is the relationship of an object and his viewer:

Ἄν μ' ἐσίδῃς, καὶ ἐγὼ σέ. σὺ μὲν βλεφάροισι δέδορκας,
 ἀλλ' ἐγὼ οὐ βλεφάροισι· σὺ γὰρ ἔχω βλέφαρα.
 ἂν δ' ἐθέλῃς, λαλέω φωνῆς δίχα· σοὶ γὰρ ὑπάρχει
 φωνή, ἐμοὶ δὲ μάτην χεῖλε' ἀνοιγόμενα.

Every time you look at me, I look at you, too. You see me with your eyes,

but I don't see with eyes, because I have no eyes.

If you want to, I talk to you without voice, because you have a voice; but for me my lips open in vain.

(*AP* 14.56)

The address of this “I” to a “you” suggests the fictive dialogue of inscribed archaic or classical epigram. At first sight, what this epigram tells its readers seems banal: considering the popularity of the well-known metaphoric “voice of the object” there would be nothing remarkable in saying that only one of the dialogue partners—the reader, of course—has a “real” voice. But we know from the heading of the poem preserved in the manuscripts that this epigram is a riddle, and that the speaking object we are meant to puzzle out is a mirror (though it would be more correct to call it “the mirror image”).

The echo and mirror epigrams are intended to be read by those who love riddles and paradoxes, especially ones where they can identify with the fictive viewers and readers. The riddle of the mirror can be solved only if one takes the position of the fictive speaker and tries to see what he sees. The relationship between the viewer and the object manifests itself not only in the act of viewing, but also in that of addressing the object, of putting this relationship into words. There is, however, no reason why one should speak to a mirror—unlike a portrait which may be questioned with regard to the person represented, her or his fate, its artist, and so on.³⁴ Nevertheless, what fascinates Hellenistic poets of epigrams is the reader's encounter with the inscribed object,

³⁴ See Anyte 8 GP (= *AP* 7.649), an epigram in which two visitors of a tomb rejoice because the dead person can be talked to.

a relationship which articulates itself verbally and which permeates the dialogic structure of epigrams even if the object is not meant to be read, but only to be seen.

Often the real nature of the object represented—if not questionable in itself, as in the case of the echo and mirror-image—appears deliberately veiled. Thus the early Hellenistic poetess Erinna exploits the ambiguity of *grammata* and *graphein*, which can be employed for an inscription as well as for a drawing:³⁵

Ἐξ ἀταλᾶν χειρῶν τάδε γράμματα· λῶστε Προμαθεῦ,
 ἔντι καὶ ἄνθρωποι τὴν ὁμαλοὶ σοφίαν
 ταύταν γοῦν ἐτύμως τὸν παρθένον ὅστις ἔγραψεν,
 αἱ καὺδ' ἄν ποτέ θηκ', ἥς κ' Ἀγαθαρχὶς ὄλα.

These *grammata* come from delicate hands. My good Prometheus,
 there are even humans who equal you in *sophia*.
 If the one who so accurately engraved this maiden had only
 added a voice, it would have been you, Agatharchis, yourself.
 (Erinna 3 GP (= AP 6.352), trans. adapted from Gutzwiller)

The mention of “delicate” or “tender” hands right at the start of the poem might make us think that they belong to a woman or girl—why not Erinna herself?—whose skill is the epigram’s main theme. It might even be an introductory poem to a section of quasi-inscriptional epigrams in this poetess’ book. The praise of *sophia*, too, could refer to her own profession, to poetry. In ancient Greek tradition Prometheus is the sculptor of human beings, but also a bringer of culture, who is said to have invented, for example, the *grammata*.³⁶ Since numerous epigrams take as their theme the lifelike quality of a picture or a sculpture,³⁷ that is doubtless the primary meaning of Erinna’s epigram, a rather conventional praise of an *objet d’art*. But more than one meaning seems possible. Perhaps the point resides in the comparison between the girl’s delicate art and the titanic force of Prometheus, or in the subtle allusions to another of kind of art—the epigrammatic—that gives voices to statues, the art over which Erinna herself is master.

In a roundabout way, by celebrating the artist’s creativity, Erinna evokes the creative act of writing. In archaic and classical epigram the making of inscriptional verse was already considered analogous to

³⁵ On this poem, see also Murray and Rowland in this volume.

³⁶ Aeschylus *Prom.* 460.

³⁷ See ἐτύμως (3) and Zanker (1986: 42–6, 56–7), Parker (2004), and Petrovic (2005: 38).

the production of sculptures or monuments.³⁸ But such early epigram, unlike later Hellenistic examples, ascribes only a minor role to its author, his skills and his intentions, as compared to the achievements of the artist and the owner of the inscribed monument. Inscriptional poetry mentions writing only if the function and the validity of an official document are to be made explicit.³⁹ Lucillius, a poet of the first century A.D., turns this convention on its head when he describes a tomb constructed for no other reason than to bear an epigram. In this way, he makes fun of fellow poets who imitate the style of inscriptional verse only for self-promotion:

Οὐδενὸς ἐνθάδε νῦν τεθνηκότος, ὃ παροδῖτα,
 Μάρκος ὁ ποιητὴς ᾠκοδόμηκε τάφον
 καὶ γράψας ἐπίγραμμα μονόστιχον ᾧδ' ἐχάραξε·
 “Κλαύσατε δωδεκέτη Μάξιμον ἐξ Ἐφέσου...”

Although nobody has died here, wanderer,
 Marcus the poet has constructed a tomb,
 composed the following monostichic epigram and had it engraved:
 “Cry for Maximus from Ephesus, twelve years old...”

(*AP* 11.312)

Lucillius here highlights ironically what happens when a genre becomes literature: its author becomes—paradoxically and against all convention—more important than the theme.⁴⁰

Play with the epigrammatic speech act (and at the same time with the meaning of the genre in general) begins in the third century B.C. Callimachus exhibits particular subtlety in manipulating the conventions of everyday inscriptional poetry. He directs the reader's attention to precisely those aspects of the genre that must have seemed artificial or old fashioned to his contemporaries. The convention of the speaking object, for example, becomes the point of departure for a humorous reflection on talking and writing:

Σύντομος ἦν ὁ ξείνος· ὃ καὶ στίχος οὐ μακρὰ λέξων
 “Θῆρις Ἀρισταίου Κρής” ἐπ' ἐμοὶ δολιχός.

The stranger was reticent, so that the line which says briefly:

“Theris son of Aristaios, a Cretan,” is too long upon me.

(Callimachus 35 GP (= 11 Pf. = *AP* 7.447), trans. Gutzwiller)

³⁸ E.g., *CEG* 819; Meyer (2005: 98, n. 265) and Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 283–349, esp. 289–91).

³⁹ E.g., *CEG* 861 (= *SGO* 01/01/01), Knidos, fourth century B.C.

⁴⁰ A further humorous point may be that funerary epigrams of Lucillius' time were often written while the person was still alive—and frequently say so.

In this epigram, Callimachus no doubt humorously uses the alleged spatial limitation of the stone to justify an aesthetic preference for brevity.⁴¹ He does not tell us here what we know from other texts: that rhetorical brevity was discussed seriously in literary circles and that it was one of the criteria for the quality of poetry, with a view towards the needs and capacities of readers or hearers. We can interpret the epigram in various ways: it may be a sympathetic characterization of a person, a joke at the cost of taciturn Cretans, a play with the convention of the “speaking object” or a meta-poetic statement by the poet.

The epigram’s play with the different media of speech, writing, and image is typical for fictional inscriptions, leaving readers in the dark about the real nature of the object represented.⁴² Even if there is a possibility that early Hellenistic epigrams like that of Callimachus above were intended as real inscriptions, they functioned so well in books that they may have originated an epigrammatic sub-genre much appreciated by readers of all times: the fictitious mock-inscription or the more serious quasi-inscriptional epitaphs.

There are epigrams in which the explicit allusion to writing and its medium serves to cast doubt on the reality and validity of an “inscriptional” document. In a dedicatory epigram Callimachus calls us to witness a written agreement that a certain Aceson wishes to make with Asclepius:

Τὸ χρέος ὡς ἀπέχεις, Ἀσκληπιέ, τὸ πρὸ γυναικὸς
 Δημοδίκης Ἀκέσων ὄφελεν εὐξάμενος,
 γινώσκειν· ἦν δ’ ἄρα λάθῃ καὶ <δίδ> μιν ἀπαιτῆς,
 φησὶ παρέξεσθαι μαρτυρίην ὁ πίναξ.

Know, Asclepius, that you have received payment for the debt
 Aceson owed because of his vow on behalf of his wife,
 Demodice. If you forget and demand payment a second time,
 The tablet says that it will bear witness for him.

(24 GP (= 54 Pf. = AP 6.147), trans. Gutzwiller)

In this poem Aceson tells the god that the written tablet addressed to him is intended to remind him of a business transaction’s proper conclusion: a vow followed by healing led to remuneration. The explicit reference to the tablet creates a quasi-bureaucratic style, similar to

⁴¹ Cameron (1995: 336), Asper (1997: 135–52), Meyer (2005: 191–2).

⁴² In the terminology of reader response theory this is a “spot of indeterminacy,” which serves to stimulate the reader, see Iser (1978: 170–8) and note 61, below. The intermediality of epigram is discussed in Petrovic (2005); see also Wagner (1996).

that of some inscriptions. A note to a doctor, accompanying payment, would not sound much different. There is nothing here of that prayerful solemnity that normally accompanies a dedication, with its thanks and pleas. Does the god, we ask ourselves, truly need this sort of pedantic instruction? Or does Callimachus' epigram not rather say more about the fascination for written documents on the part of some of his contemporaries than about their religious feelings?

Callimachus was interested not only in the rhetorical and often comic effects of a contradictory *mise en scène*, but behind the play with epigrammatic convention there are serious concerns linked directly to the "work" of the poet, particularly in questions of knowledge, recognition and credibility.⁴³ These are issues throughout his *œuvre*. When knowledge is acquired by reading—epigrams, for instance—no author is present to confirm our understanding.⁴⁴ Callimachus shows us that in epigram the fiction of a personal speaker is not sufficient to resolve the problem of a declaration's credibility:⁴⁵

Φησὶν ὃ με στήσας Εὐαίνετος (οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε
γινώσκω) νίκης ἀντί με τῆς ἰδίας
ἀγκεῖσθαι χάλκειον ἀλέκτορα Τυνδαρίδῃσι·
πιστεύω Φαίδρου παιδὶ Φιλοξενίδεω.

Euaenetus who placed me here declares—for I myself have
no knowledge—that I, a bronze cock, am dedicated
to the Tyndaridae because of a victory I won.
I trust the son of Phaedrus, son of Philoxenus.

(25 GP (= 56 Pf. = AP 6.149), trans. Gutzwiller)

Euaenetus must here transmit a message to the viewer of the bronze cock, which the cock, as messenger, has apparently put into verse and on which he comments. But instead of guaranteeing the truth of the account—a function of a good messenger—the cock points out in a slightly pedantic way that a bronze is not really capable of knowing a thing, and (worse yet) in so doing he directs the reader's attention to the absence of the real author. It is perhaps no coincidence that

⁴³ Walsh (1991).

⁴⁴ This is Plato's well-known objection, *Phaedr.* 275d–e. In the same passage, Plato reproaches written texts for resembling paintings in so far as they simulate life and vividness, thus making one think that they can speak intelligently, whereas in reality they never say anything new if one asks them questions.

⁴⁵ Meyer (1993: 166–7), Meyer (2005: 196–9), and Köhnken (1993: 119–30, esp. 128–9).

Callimachus only calls into question writing and truth in the dedicatory epigrams, which normally assert a truth claim vis-à-vis the deity. Apart from the sceptical attitude towards naïve religious ideas, which Callimachus shows in other epigrams, 25 GP reveals something about the poet's intended reading public. The epistemological problems concern the group of professional readers and poets in search of sure information and broader knowledge.

In dedicatory epigrams, authorial intention and the act of writing do not have the same function as in epitaphs. Writing to a god happens with concrete aims and expectations, just like writing letters. But contrary to "locostatic" inscriptions, letters have to travel.⁴⁶ When an inscribed object is itself sent as a letter, the epigrammatic and the epistolary form are "crossed," a phenomenon exhibited in varying degrees within a certain group of Hellenistic epigrams.⁴⁷ Objects on which we normally do not expect to find inscriptions can be used to smuggle messages, as Herodotean tricksters already demonstrated. In Hellenistic love-poetry this is the role of the love apple:⁴⁸

Μῆλον ἐγώ· βάλλει με φιλῶν σέ τις, ἀλλ' ἐπίνευσον,
Ξανθίππῃ· κἀγὼ καὶ σὺ μαραινόμεθα.

I am an apple. Someone who loves you throws me. But nod your consent,

Xanthippe, for both I and you are wasting away.

(AP 5.80, "Plato" 5 *FGE*)

In the *GA* we find a certain number of epigrammatic epistles addressed to a particular person identified by name. Moreover, Philodemus, Crinagoras and Rufinus present themselves as authors and senders of such letters, thus going against inscribed epigram's convention of an anonymous author. Although one model for such poems is dedicatory epigram, it is remote. Rather, they constitute an essentially new epigrammatic genre which allows the poet to introduce himself repeatedly by name, a great advantage for those who work under the conditions of literary patronage.⁴⁹

⁴⁶ Ehlich (1994: 18–41), Meyer (2005: 19, n. 68).

⁴⁷ Rosenmeyer (2002).

⁴⁸ See Rosenmeyer (2002: 145). It seems that in ancient literature it is impossible *not* to read if you know how to do so, provided there is no material obstacle and that the text is legible. This simple fact is often used to manipulate readers, especially in the case of oaths; see Meyer (2005: 233–4) and Rutherford (2000: 149–50).

⁴⁹ Rosenmeyer (2002: 143).

In Hellenistic times, then, the act of writing becomes a theme of epigram despite the oralistic conventions of the genre. Authors of literary epigrams deliberately focus on their poems' materiality and writtenness in order to make visible the fictitiousness of the typical speech acts. In the same way they reveal the fiction of the messenger—be it a statue or a stone—as an omniscient representative of an anonymous author; the voice of the object, an unconscious and *eo ipso* unquestionable metaphor in ancient epigram, is playfully problematized or, as in the epistolary epigrams, simply replaced by the voice of the author. These new features in Hellenistic epigrams are the result of the importance the poets attach to their professional status; and in epigram they found an especially apt vehicle for reflecting on all questions about how to do things with written words. In addition to this, we find a new kind of interplay between readers and authors, as authors make their presence felt behind conventional fictive stand-ins. The deconstruction of fictitious speech acts, the concept of *ponos*, and the semi-private, semi-public form of epistolary communication all serve to construct the author's *persona*.

Let us now examine the act of reading. In several epigrams Callimachus shows us an individual's act of reception which is not guided by a monument but by the viewer's own experience.⁵⁰ Individual memories and personal conclusions characterize the Callimachean "act of thinking." In 50 GP (= 58 Pf. = *AP* 7.277) the poet gives voice to the thoughts of a person who has found the corpse of an anonymous shipwreck:⁵¹

Τίς, ξένος ὦ ναυηγέ; Λεόντιχος ἐνθάδε νεκρὸν
 εὔρεν ἐπ' αἰγιαλοῦ, χῶσε δὲ τῷδε τάφῳ
 δακρύσας ἐπίκηρον ἐὼν βίον· οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτὸς
 ἥσυχος, αἰθυίη δ' ἴσα θαλασσοπορεῖ.

Who are you, shipwrecked stranger? Leontichus found the corpse here
 on the seashore and gave a burial by piling up this grave,
 bewailing his own hazardous way of life, for he can't live the quiet life
 either,
 but roams the sea like a seagull.

(trans. Zanker)

⁵⁰ Walsh (1991: 101–3).

⁵¹ See the discussion in Bing (1995b: 124–6), Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 317–8), Zanker (2004: 82), Bruss (2005b: 156–9), and Meyer (2005: 206–8).

“Who are you?” is the typical beginning of a dialogic epitaph whenever an anonymous questioner wishes to know the name of the deceased. It is only after reading the whole epigram that one understands that a certain Leontichus—traditional speaker-parts reversed—must have posed this question to an anonymous corpse before he built him a grave. Leontichus endows the seaman’s death with a meaning he deduces from his own experience, and makes the stranger reflect his own destiny. Indeed, self-reflection and independent construction of meaning serve to characterize Leontichus. Upon finding this anonymous corpse he reacts like an especially thoughtful and introspective viewer or a reader facing a monument: coming to grips with the lives of others usually leads us to reflect on our own condition. This is an example of the poet’s psychological realism.

A unique funerary epigram by the same poet demonstrates the mental activity of a reader of an inscription step by step:⁵²

“Τιμονόη.” τίς δ’ ἐσσί; μὰ δαίμονας, οὐ σ’ ἄν ἐπέγνων,
εἰ μὴ Τιμοθέου πατρὸς ἐπὶ ὄνομα
στήλη καὶ Μήθυμνα τεὴ πόλις. ἦ μέγα φημὶ
χῆρον ἀνιᾶσθαι σὸν πόσιν Εὐθυμένη.

“Timonoe.” Who are you? By the gods, I wouldn’t have recognized
you
if the name of your father, Timotheus, weren’t
upon your headstone, and Methymna, your city. Deeply distressed,
indeed,
I’m sure, is your bereaved husband, Euthymenes.

(Callimachus 40 GP (= 15 Pf. = *AP* 7.522), trans. Zanker)

This is a dialogue with a dead person in form alone. Far more, it is an interior conversation of the viewer-reader with himself in the act of reading, accompanied by tacit thoughts and comments. The reader is an autonomous subject, not the docile “voice” of the inscription ready to pronounce conventional sepulchral formulas to memorialize or appease the dead.⁵³ Here it is the reader who controls the pace of the reading. Perhaps because the image of Timonoe on the stele is unrecognizable, the reader takes great care to show us how he arrived at the identification. Here again it is not just the inscription but personal experience which help him, albeit with a notable detachment: he

⁵² See (1991: 95–7), Meyer (1993), Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 318–20), Zanker (2004: 80–2, 165–6), and Meyer (2005: 202–4).

⁵³ See Walsh (1991: 78–9) on *GG* 176.4.

does not bewail Timonoe's death but soberly reflects on her husband's emotions. Unlike the obligatory public mourning of the anonymous passerby in traditional verse inscriptions, here we see the credible reaction of a reader who comes across the tomb of an acquaintance. The fictive reader seems to be virtually a professional, able to cope with a problem of textual or iconographic transmission—like Callimachus and his scholarly colleagues.

The reader as an actor in the miniature drama of epigram is not an invention of Hellenistic epigram, but in this period we meet attitudes and practices typical for readers even where unexpected, as in a Callimachean dedicatory epigram which evokes the kind of question and answer normally found in epitaphs:

Τὶν με, λεοντάγχ' ὄνα συοκτόνε, φήγινον ὄζον
θῆκε—Τίς;—Ἀρχῖνος.—Ποῖος—Ὁ Κρής.—Δέχομαι.

For you, lion-strangling, boar-slaying lord, I, an oak club,
was dedicated...—By whom?—Archinus:—From where?—He's a
Cretan:—I accept.

(Callimachus 22 GP (= 34 Pf. = AP 6.351), trans. Gutzwiller)

Unusual here is not just a dedicatory epigram in dialogic form, but also what is said. The theme of a dedication is usually an offering, the reason for giving it, and what one wishes to obtain. The god's acceptance, on the other hand, can only be requested, not declared, and there are no inscriptions (as far as I know) representing a god virtually snatching up the gift.⁵⁴ Heracles acts like the questioner in classical epigrams, but it is not curiosity or politeness that causes him to intervene. His prompt reaction aims rather to accelerate the action, to shorten the discourse of an over-zealous and apparently long-winded speaker.⁵⁵ Impatience is a characteristic of readers of verse inscriptions and of inscribed communication generally, as we have seen above ("before you can say...").

In Callimachus we find the typical qualities of Hellenistic readers: thirst for knowledge, intellectual curiosity, and a characteristic pleasure

⁵⁴ Although among literary epigrams we do have, e.g., Leonidas 27 GP (= AP 9.316).

⁵⁵ Köhnken (1993: 121–3), Gutzwiller (1998b: 194–5), Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 317), Meyer (2005: 214–5). An analogous acceleration of the communication of information which is transferred to the wanderer *en passant*, can be also found in other epigrams of Callimachus; see Walsh (1991: 79–82). The exterior movement of the passerby is integrated in the structure of the poem.

when a *zetema* has been found by precise observation and logical deduction. The experience of reading and interpreting is even transferred to other situations of life which appear prominently in Hellenistic epigram, especially the “reading” of the symptoms of love-sick symposiasts in erotic epigrams. Thus, reading also becomes a metaphor for a special mode of contemplating a beloved, an epigrammatic motif playfully varied by later epigrammatists.⁵⁶

Hellenistic authors, then, use epigram’s fictive reader to reflect on their own modes of behavior, personal experiences, and practices having to do with their profession: the categorization, e.g., listing in *pinakes*, of ancient authors (who were “dead persons” just like the tomb occupants of epitaph) and the meticulous study of texts which are often difficult or riddling. The accuracy and creativity that Callimachus’ fictive readers display in constructing sense mirror the precision and originality the poet claims for the process of writing. Ultimately, the Hellenistic poet includes himself in that “combined effort” which, according to J.-P. Sartre, constitutes an essential element of literature.

In the only surviving poem of Heraclitus of Halicarnassus, a contemporary and friend of Callimachus, two attentive readers examine—as methodically as Hellenistic researchers usually do—a grave and its inscription in order to find out to whom it belongs:

Ἄ κόνις ἀρτίσκαπτος, ἐπὶ στάλας δὲ μετώπων
 σείονται φύλλων ἡμιθαλεῖς στέφανοι
 γράμμα διακρίναντες, ὁδοιπόρε, πέτρον ἴδωμεν,
 λυγρὰ περιστέλλειν ὅστέα φατὶ τίνος.
 “Ξεῖν’, Ἀρετημιάς εἰμι· πάτρα Κνίδος· Εὐφρονος ἦλθον
 εἰς λέχος· ὠδίνων οὐκ ἄμορος γενόμαν·
 δισσὰ δ’ ὁμοῦ τίκτουςα τὸ μὲν λίπον ἀνδρὶ ποδηγὸν
 γήρως, ἐν δ’ ἀπάγῳ μναμόσυνον πόσιος.” 5

The earth is recently dug, and on the faces of the stele
 quiver garlands of half-wilted flowers.

Deciphering the letters, traveller, let us look to see
 Whose smooth bones the stone claims to cover.

“Stranger, I am Aretemias, my country Cnidos, I came to the bed 5
 Of Euphron not without experience of childbirth.

In giving birth to twins, I left one to comfort my husband’s
 old age, and one I take as remembrance of him.”

(Heraclitus 1 GP (= AP 7.465), trans. Gutzwiller)

⁵⁶ Cf. Numenius of Tarsus, AP 12.28: “I don’t read the beautiful young man, I see him.”

The first two verses indicate that it must be a literary and fictitious epigram, since impermanent elements like half-wilted flowers normally belong in literary *ekphraseis*, not verse inscriptions. In the third verse the situation of the speech act becomes clear: an anonymous speaker and a passerby prepare to read the epitaph. Thus, we know that the act of reading itself follows in the epigram's second half. However, unlike the Callimachean examples examined above, there are no signs of reading activities and reader-response. The deceased simply utters a first person speech summing up the circumstances of her death, just as in classical funerary epigrams. There is no visible relationship, no link between the two fictive readers and the dead women. What is more, she addresses only one of the two—or rather none, as it seems that she is not talking to an individual but to a generic anonymous “stranger.” There is nothing unusual in the structure of question and answer, except that the poet has found a way to make clear that the “answer” is identical with the act of reading. What is unique in this epigram is the role of the fictive specialist who guides the wanderer by directing his attention to certain elements of the monument. Hunter and Gutzwiller have shown that the role of the “guide” can best be understood if we assume that he is a mask for the author, Heraclitus, through which he addresses his reading public.⁵⁷ The author in the fictive role of reader incites the wanderer—i.e., his reader—to visualize the imaginary scene and scrutinize the verses he has composed. Maybe—but there is no certainty—this epigram was meant to be the introductory poem of a collection of epigrams by Heraclitus. It is true that it would be a perfect invitation for the reader “to join in the very act of reading.”⁵⁸ If we suppose on the one hand that the poet adopts the role of speaker and reader, and on the other that the recipient of the poem plays the companion role and reads along with him, the epigram is something rare and precious indeed, for it would dramatize the shared realization, viz. bringing-into-being, of a literary text by the combined effort of author and reader—but perhaps such an interpretation is anachronistic.⁵⁹

⁵⁷ Hunter (1992: 115–6), Gutzwiller (1998b: 250–2); cf. Meyer (2005: 119–20).

⁵⁸ Gutzwiller (1998b: 251).

⁵⁹ Gutzwiller (1998b: 251): “And to the extent that we identify the narrator with the poet and the traveller with the implied reader, the epitaph constitutes a text in process of composition; composition itself thus becomes a joint project of writer and reader.”

In keeping with the pleasure of viewers and readers in testing their intellectual capacities as a distinctive feature of the new Hellenistic “culture of reception,” some epigrams extol the intelligence of the fictive interpreter. The *GA*, in fact, contains a series of fictitious epitaphs (7.421–9) on the correct interpretation of the symbolic decoration of funerary monuments.⁶⁰ Leonidas, Alcaeus of Messene, Antipater of Sidon and Meleager show us fictive readers advancing hypotheses, rejecting erroneous conclusions, and defining the “correct” way of understanding. The internal dynamics of thought structure the poem: there is no “external” addressee except the “self” of the speaking subject whose private reading leads, at least briefly, to incorrect hypotheses and finally a correct interpretation.⁶¹ The second- or first-century B.C. riddle epitaph of Antipater, for instance, demonstrates the readerly prowess of the poet who represents himself as a brilliant interpreter—a self-representation even more overt than in Callimachus:

Ἄ στάλα, φέρ' ἴδω, τίν' ἔχει νέκυν. ἀλλὰ δέδορκα
 γράμμα μὲν οὐδέν που τμαθὲν ὑπερθε λίθου,
 ἐννέα δ' ἀστραγάλους πεπτηότας· ὧν πίσυρες μὲν
 πρῆτοι Ἀλεξάνδρου μαρτυρέουσι βόλον,
 οἱ δὲ τὸ τᾶς νεότατος ἐφάλικος ἄνθος, ἔφηβον, 5
 εἷς δ' ὅ γε μανύει Χίος ἀφαιρότερον.
 ἦ ῥα τόδ' ἀγγέλλοντι· “Καὶ ὁ σκάπτροισι μεγαυχῆς
 χῶ θάλλων ἦβᾱ τέρμα τὸ μηδὲν ἔχει”;
 ἦ τὸ μὲν οὐ; δοκέω δὲ ποτὶ σκοπὸν ἰθὺν ἐλάσσειν
 ἰόν, Κρηταιεὺς ὥς τις οἰστοβόλος 10
 ἦς ὁ θανὼν Χίος μὲν, Ἀλεξάνδρου δὲ λελογχῶς
 οὔνομ', ἐφηβείῃ δ' ὤλετ' ἐν ἀλικίᾳ.
 ὥς εὖ τὸν φθίμενον νέον ἄκριτα καὶ τὸ κυβευθὲν
 πνεῦμα δι' ἀφθέγκτων εἶπέ τις ἀστραγάλων.

Let me see whose death this stele reports. But I see
 no writing engraved anywhere on the stone,
 just nine dice, tossed, of which the first four
 bear witness to the throw called Alexander,
 the next four the ephebe throw, the bloom of youthful maturity, 5
 and this one shows the lowest throw, the Chian.
 Do they announce: “A man who proudly ruled with the sceptre
 and was in the bloom of youth came to naught”?

⁶⁰ The signs interpreted may be icons (images) or letters; Goldhill (1994: 199–205), Gutzwiller (1998b: 236, 265–76), Zanker (2004: 101–2), Meyer (2005: 121–4); and see Männlein-Robert in this volume.

⁶¹ Walsh (1990).

No, that's not it, but I think that now I shoot my arrow
 straight at the target, like a Cretan bowman. 10
 The dead man was a Chian, he had acquired the name
 of Alexander, and he died in ephebic youth.
 How well someone has said with voiceless dice that the young man
 died through recklessness, his life staked and lost.
 (Antipater of Sidon 32 GP (= AP 7.427), trans. Gutzwiller)

In this epigram the fictive viewer tries to understand an atypical inscription—or rather picture? ἀγγέλλοντι (7) and εἰπέ (14) are characteristically used to denote the interaction of the text and the reader in epigram, the first alluding to the messenger function a written text can metaphorically adopt; the second (εἰπέ τις), to an alleged anonymous author who expressed an idea symbolically by a “voiceless” picture. A third metaphor which describes the act of comprehension is drawn from archery as, e.g., in Pindar *Ol.* 2.83–5 and 9.5–7. In these odes, well known and much imitated by Hellenistic poets, Pindar's or the Muses' arrows speak eloquently to the συνετοί, but need an interpreter to be intelligible to the masses: the image thus combines aspects of poetic production and reception, precisely as we find it in Antipater of Sidon. Of course, Antipater was not the only epigrammatist to figure the act of understanding through a poetologic metaphor: in the riddling Alcaeus of Messene 16 GP cited above the poet chooses the image of the correct way, a metaphor used both for poetry and in the terminology of the Mysteries. Whether hitting the mark with his arrows or choosing the correct way, the poet-interpreter ranks himself among the συνετοί and σοφοί.

Epistemological problems and riddles in epigrams also form part of the text's implicit *Wirkungsstruktur*. A fictive viewer's doubts about the right interpretation of a female portrait, for instance, lead the actual reader of Asclepiades 39 GP (= AP 16.68; perhaps by Posidippus) to construct in his mind a certain image of the person who is the subject of the poem:⁶²

Κύπριδος ἄδ' εἰκὼν· φέρ' ἰδόμεθα, μὴ Βερενίκας
 διστάζω, ποτέρῃ φῆ τις ὁμοιότεραν.

“This is the portrait of Cypris.”—“Come on, let's make sure it isn't Berenice's:
 I'm in two minds as to which of the two one should say it's more like.”
 (trans. Zanker)

⁶² Gutzwiller (1998b: 122, n. 21), Meyer (2005: 118–9).

"This is the portrait of Cypris" misleads by suggesting an inscription accompanying the image; only in what follows does the speech act become clear as a fictive viewer's hypothesis countered by another with no ultimate resolution. The misunderstandings of the fictive interpreter make the portrait clearer for the actual reader of the epigram; and the lack of a simple solution prompts him to consider possible interpretations. This "spot of indeterminacy" (*Unbestimmtheitsstelle*) guides our reading beyond a literal interpretation to see the poem actually as a compliment from the poet to queen Berenice.

Acts of reading within Hellenistic epigrams may be understood as a means chosen by poets to appeal to the knowledge and experience they share with the reading public:⁶³ fictive viewers and readers perform precisely those actions which characterize the reading of epigrams. The pseudo-Platonic epigram on the love apple cited above, for instance, addresses a fictive (female) reader who must identify its author and guess his intention (an easy task in this instance). The actual reader of the epigram, on the other hand, admires the ruse of the fictive author and the wit of the actual poet in choosing a significant object for the "inscription." The epigram's charm consists of the text's invitation to reconstruct a possible context by supplementing what is known about the symbolic value of apples thrown in other literary texts or in reality. Likewise, Callimachus' epigram on the shipwrecked Leontichus depends on the reader closing semantic "gaps" or "blanks" (*Leerstellen*) with sense in an independent and individual way. In playing the "Ergänzungsspiel," the reader establishes connections the text does not formulate to arrive at a conclusion by combination and induction.⁶⁴

In Hellenistic epigram, the implied reader can be identified with those strategies of the text which let him participate in an active and creative way in the realization of the poem. In some cases, this is accomplished by the indeterminacy of the image evoked, in others by paradoxical and complicated fictitious speech acts. Epigrammatists underline ambiguities and paradoxes typical of the genre, made more potent with the loss of epigram's original context on the monument. Pseudo-oral speech acts and paradoxical metaphors of speaking stones and other objects fascinate authors and readers, involving readers in

⁶³ Goldhill (1994: 210, 213).

⁶⁴ This is the decisive moment in the act of reading and a central concept of the theory of aesthetic response according to Ingarden and Iser; cf. Richter (1996: 527–35) for "indeterminacy" and "concretization"; see also Bing (1995b: 116), Stierle (1975), and Maurer (1977).

the text. Speech may now become “audible thought,” as G.B. Walsh has put it, and creative, unlike in ancient epigram where readers must strictly follow the monument’s instructions. The very game of reading invites practice in reading, so that the epigrams constitute their audience—an audience of educated, élite readers of literature. The aesthetic experience of reading epigram seems for the first time to create an identity for its reader.

GENDERED VOICES IN HELLENISTIC EPIGRAM

Jackie Murray and Jonathan M. Rowland

Introduction

Prior to the Hellenistic period, the gendered voice of a poem was linked to the gender of the poet or performer. Although the separability of the poet's voice and identity from the voice, subjectivity and/or focalization of the poem was always a feature of Greek poetics, the social function that poetry had and the public nature of its performance limited the amount of experimentation and innovation that an individual poet could engage in, especially with respect to the representation of female voice. Traditionally "male" genres, such as drama, hexameter and elegy, precluded the expression of an authentic female voice. The performances of these genres before the community, whether local or Panhellenic, reinforced the patriarchal values that tended to check female freedoms and public expression of female subjectivity, especially before mixed or predominantly male audiences.¹ The vehicles available to poets for expressing an authentic female voice were few.² Even in song types traditionally associated with female public performance—songs for female choruses, lamentations, and wedding songs—female subjectivity was moderated.³ The public nature of these performances insisted that female voices also promoted the male oriented values and reinforced the patriarchal culture.⁴ Authentic female subjectivity and focalization was restricted to genres that were performed before an all-female audience, the poetry connected with all-women religious festivals, and the personal poetry of women's circles, such as the one commonly associated with Sappho.⁵ Genuine female voices could also be heard in the lower genres which were performed in private, such

¹ Stehle (1997: 119–261).

² The exception seems to be the performance of *aischrologia*, the exchange of invective between men and women in ritual contexts; see O'Higgins (2001).

³ On the lack of authentic female subjectivity in these genres see Stehle (1997: 71–118).

⁴ Stehle (1997: 199–261).

⁵ Stehle (1997: 262–325).

as lullabies and songs about women's occupations, such as grinding, harvesting, spinning and weaving;⁶

Nevertheless, expression of something approaching genuine female subjectivity or focalization did exist in public performance or in traditionally male genres, but it was usually exploited for invective or comic effect or reoriented to a male subjectivity.⁷ The generic appropriation of female song genres, such as female choruses and lamentation in drama and epic, served a male oriented agenda and expressed a primarily male subjectivity.⁸ Similarly, the reperformance of Sappho's poetry by men at symposia appropriated its authentic female eroticism to serve male oriented eroticism. The gender of the actual performer added an important dimension as well. As Laura McClure observes, much of the cross-dressing humor in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Ecclesiazusae* depends on the "inappropriate" public expression of female subjectivity and modes of speech.⁹ In tragedy or epic, the representation of men lamenting tended to render them effeminate,¹⁰ whereas the representation of rhetorically savvy women, such as Aeschylus' Clytemnestra or Euripides' Medea, rendered them dangerous.¹¹ In short, in the poetry of the archaic and classical periods, female voices were heard—but usually only to reinforce male social ideals.

In the Hellenistic period, the shift away from performance as the primary way in which poetry was experienced allowed female poets to express their genius and subjectivity in the genres that were traditionally male.¹² This important innovation was not confined to female poets; male poets, inspired by the innovations of their female predecessors and contemporaries, soon began to experiment with the impersonation of authentic female voice in these same genres, but in a way that did

⁶ Snyder (1989: 40); Gutzwiller (1997a); McClure (2001: 10, with n. 31); work songs: Karanika (2002); wedding song: Hague (1983); lullabies: Waern (1960); Rosemeyer (1991: 23–4).

⁷ Holst-Warhaft (1992); Gutzwiller (1997a: 202); Snyder (1989: 38–63).

⁸ Skinner (1982) and (2001); Gutzwiller (1997a: 203–4); cf. Katz (1991), Felson-Rubin (1994), and Doherty (1995) who try to extract a feminine perspective in the appropriation of these genres in epic. See for a contrasting view Murnaghan (1999) who sees the female voices in epic as potentially subversive to the masculinity of the genre.

⁹ McClure (2001: 3–4); on speech genres in general see Bakhtin (1986: 78).

¹⁰ On lamentation as a female speech genre see Alexiou (1974); Holst-Warhaft (1992); Foley (1993); Sultan (1993); Stears (1998); Murnaghan (1999).

¹¹ Worman (2001); Griffiths (2001).

¹² On the shift from performance to reading see Bing (1988b); on the effect of this shift on female poets see Gutzwiller (1997a).

not, as its primary function, reinforce the patriarchal culture.¹³ This new possibility for poets of both genders to express an authentic female subjectivity in genres that were traditionally gendered as male changed the way gendered voice functioned in Greek poetics. It introduced an entirely new type of gendered voice, a voice that is simultaneously masculine and feminine, which we refer to as “trans-gendered.”

Erinna

Kathryn Gutzwiller (1997a) convincingly demonstrates that the poet responsible for introducing an authentic female voice into male-gendered poetry was the mid-fourth century B.C. poet Erinna.¹⁴ Her influential poem, the *Distaff*, which mourns the death of her childhood friend Baucis, combines the meter, diction and style of epic with female themes and personal perspective drawn from Sappho.¹⁵ Erinna’s innovation was the way in which she represented female lamentation in hexameter poetry, infusing Homeric *goos* with a genuine female voice.¹⁶ The *Distaff* introduced Erinna’s ancient readers to an authentic female voice unfiltered by the ventriloquizing male voice of the epic narrator. As Gutzwiller felicitously puts it, Erinna’s *Distaff* liberated a genuine female subjectivity from its “encasement in epic narrative.”¹⁷

Another interesting feature of the poem is the level of self consciousness invested in this authentic female voice. Within the hexameters of her *Distaff* Erinna’s mourning persona, which she identifies with herself, establishes her poetic voice as first and foremost that of an “epic poetess” (a concept which in itself would have been a paradox for her readers). As she does so she also highlights the restrictions

¹³ For an example of this phenomenon, see Bing (1995a).

¹⁴ Gow and Page (1965: 2.281–2), Scholz (1973); West (1977: 95–6).

¹⁵ We use the term “epic” here to designate poetry composed in hexameters, and to emphasize its association with Homeric poetry. On Erinna’s fame in antiquity see especially *AP* 7.12, 713; 9.190; on the influence of Sappho on Erinna see also Bowra (1936: 342), Rauk (1989), Cavallini (1991: 129–30), Parsons (1993: 154); Rayor (2005). On the text of the *Distaff* see Levin (1962), West (1977), Lloyd-Jones and Parsons (1983), Pardini (1991a) and Neri (1997: 57–68).

¹⁶ See also Skinner (1982: 265) who compares the *Distaff* to the laments for Hector in *Iliad* 22 and 24.

¹⁷ Gutzwiller (1997a: 207).

imposed upon her, both as a woman and as a composer of poetry.¹⁸ A crucial element of Erinna's poetic agenda, as far as we can detect from the *Distaff*, is the way she engages with the conventions governing the representation of female speech. Particularly interesting is her appropriation of *aidōs*, "self-restraint" or "modesty," a male oriented desiderandum in young women, to inform the female subjectivity of her poem.¹⁹ Gutzwiller reads *Aidōs* in the *Distaff* as Erinna's Muse, who exemplifies the internalization of the social controls on female behavior and speech. *Aidōs* keeps Erinna gazing at her distaff and "forces her to compose this literary lament in place of performing an oral *goos* at Baucis' funeral. Her poetic achievement was thus a direct response to her limited opportunity to speak in a public setting."²⁰ Extending this argument, Stehle (2001) shows convincingly that the personified *Aidōs* and Aphrodite are opposed in the *Distaff*. Her analysis of the childhood reminiscences demonstrates that they encode what mothers taught their daughters about *sōphrosyne*, "self-control." She also compares Aphrodite's effect on Helen's memory in Erinna's two major models, Sappho and Homer. In Sappho (16.8–12) Aphrodite causes Helen to forget her husband, child and parents, whereas in the *Iliad* (3.139–40) the goddess causes her to forget Paris and long for Menelaus, Sparta and her parents. Stehle concludes that Erinna's complaint is that Aphrodite made Baucis forget her mother's teachings about *sōphrosyne*, and not Erinna or their childhood games, as Bowra assumed.²¹ We would add that Erinna indirectly accuses Baucis of never having acquired *aidōs* and of therefore allowing herself to be lead astray by her desires. The poetess also contrasts herself with Baucis: she did acquire *Aidōs*.²²

Stehle draws from *AP* 9.190 (quoted in full below) the reason Erinna probably gave in the *Distaff* for not attending Baucis' funeral: Erinna's

¹⁸ Gutzwiller (1997a: 203–11); Manwell (2005: 76); Arthur (1980: 64); Pomeroy (1978). For other "oxymoronic" aspects of Erinna's poetry see Stehle (2001). For the idea that the *Distaff* is concerned with the suppression of female social and poetic expression see especially Gutzwiller (1997a: 208) and Stehle (2001).

¹⁹ *Aidōs* appears twice in the papyrus remains of the text close to the end of the poem (34, 42); on the text see Neri (1997: 62–3) and West (1977: 109–12), who suggests that in these lines Erinna is addressed by a personified *Aidōs*.

²⁰ Gutzwiller (1997a: 210).

²¹ According to Bowra (1936: 325–42), lines 28–30 of the papyrus (Lloyd-Jones and Parsons 1983 = *SH* 401), in which Erinna complains that Aphrodite made Baucis forget, evoke Sappho's longing for her followers as they get married and leave her behind.

²² Cf. Stehle (2001: 193–4).

mother forbade her on grounds of propriety.²³ In other words, Erinna's mother forbade her in order to prevent her from besmirching her own reputation by being seen as an associate of Baucis, who rejected her mother's teachings about *sōphrosyne*. Stehle does not go so far, but she does say, "*Aidōs* demands that she disavow Baucis—and yet it tears at her."²⁴ We see no need, however, for the *Distaff* itself to give the reason for Erinna's absence in explicit terms. The *indirect* accusation that Stehle detects in her reading of Erinna's reflection on their childhood games and experiences and in the appeal to *Aidōs*' admonition are more than enough to hint at what would have been clear to Erinna's ancient readers. The strictures of *aidōs* and *sōphrosyne* and Erinna's love for Baucis *demand* that she only hint at the impropriety of her friend; to speak more directly would risk turning the *Distaff* into an invective.

Through their combined analyses of the *Distaff*, Gutzwiller and Stehle support the inference that Erinna constructed her poetic voice as that of a "poetess" self-consciously engaging the restrictions imposed not only on female speech and behavior in a public space, but also those imposed on a female poet composing in a male genre. Their combined interpretations point to an attractive metapoetic reading that is reinforced by the reception of the *Distaff* in *AP* 9.190:

Λέσβιον Ἡρίνης τόδε κηρίον· εἰ δέ τι μικρόν,
 ἀλλ' ὅλον ἐκ Μουσέων κιννάμενον μέλιτι.
 οἱ δὲ τριηκόσιοι ταύτης στίχοι ἴσοι Ὀμήρῳ,
 τῆς καὶ παρθενικῆς ἔννεακαιδεκέτεως·
 ἥ καὶ ἐπ' ἡλακάτῃ μητρός φόβῳ, ἥ καὶ ἐφ' ἰστῷ
 ἐστίκει Μουσέων λάτρις ἐφαπτομένη.
 Σαπφὼ δ' Ἡρίνης ὅσσον μελέεσσιν ἀμείνων,
 Ἥριννα Σαπφοῦς τόσσον ἐν ἐξαμέτροις.

This is the Lesbian honeycomb of Erinna. Although it's a tiny thing, it is nevertheless steeped in honey from the Muses. Her three hundred verses are equal to Homer—and she was a mere maiden of nineteen. Either plying her distaff in fear of her mother, or at the loom she stood a busy worker of the Muses. Sappho as far as she surpassed Erinna in lyrics, Erinna so far surpassed Sappho in hexameters.

²³ For various speculations as to why Erinna could not attend, see West (1977: 108–9) who suggests that she was legally prohibited because of her age; Skinner (1982: 268–9) who suggests that she could not attend because she was not a relative; Latte (1953: 88), Scheidweiler (1956: 49) and Rauk (1989: 102–7) accept von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf's idea that the funeral was abroad and illness prevented her.

²⁴ Stehle (2001: 197).

As its title suggests, on some level the *Distaff* can be read as a literary adaptation of a work-song. This epigram thus makes the metapoetic point that Erinna the poet is mirrored by her persona plying the distaff. It is significant then that the epigram refers to Erinna as a worker of the Muses (Μουσέων λάτρης, 6), since it concretizes the metaphor “weaving poetry” while alluding to a female gendered song-genre. Erinna’s *Distaff* transposes both a female voice and a female genre into the male genre of epic. Thus *Aidōs* is the appropriate Muse-figure for Erinna. Just as the inappropriateness involved in participating in the public lamentation of Baucis invokes *Aidōs*, in the same way is *Aidōs* invoked by the inappropriateness of mixing work-song with epic *goos*. The *Distaff* thus represents Erinna’s disobedient obedience to her *aidōs* by providing her with a poetic way to satisfy her longing to lament Baucis in public: it cloaks her authentic female voice in the male armor of epic.

Ironically, however, it is neither Gutzwiller nor Stehle, but Martin West (1977), who to our mind has hit upon the most crucial quality of the gendered voice of the *Distaff*, which is, we argue, representative of Erinna’s poetic voice in general. He notoriously put forward the argument that the poem must have been written by a *man* impersonating an unsophisticated 19-year-old girl because in his view a young girl would be incapable of producing the poem’s polished epic style.²⁵ Soundly refuted as West’s argument may be, it nevertheless points out the transgendered quality of the voice of the *Distaff*. Although the girlhood theme, the mixing of work-song and *goos* genres, and the personal female perspective combine to instill Erinna’s hexameters with an authentic female voice, these aspects of the *Distaff* are nevertheless not enough to mute the masculinity of the epic genre that the meter, diction and style register. On the contrary, the female voice intensifies the masculinity of the genre, creating a poignant effect. This juxtaposition of a distinctly female voice in a conventionally male genre is an important feature of the *Distaff* that would have resonated with ancient readers, and it is most likely this effect that made Erinna the darling of the Hellenistic poets and earned her the honor of being praised for equaling Homer.

²⁵ See Pomeroy (1978: 19–20) and Arthur [Katz] (1980: 55–8) for refutation of West’s thesis. See also Snyder (1989: 96) who notes that whether it has any autobiographical value or not, the *Distaff* can safely be taken as “a genuine record of female experience transmuted and transmitted through the medium of poetry.”

Erinna's epigrams

Three epigrams are attributed to Erinna: two are epitaphs for Baucis (*AP* 7.710 = 1 GP; *AP* 7.712 = 2 GP) and one is a dedication of a portrait of a girl named Agatharchis (*AP* 6.352 = 3 GP). All three self-consciously engage the issues raised by the *Distaff* surrounding the representation of an authentic female voice in male gendered poetry.

The epitaphs for Baucis are in an obvious dialogue with the *Distaff*, but it is interesting that they are both concerned with the restraints placed on female voice. Erinna 1 GP:

Στᾶλαι καὶ Σειρῆνες ἐμαὶ καὶ πένθιμε κρῳσσέ,
 ὅστις ἔχεις Αἶδα τὰν ὀλίγαν σποδιάν,
 τοῖς ἐμὸν ἐρχομένοισι παρ' ἡρίον εἵπατε χαίρειν,
 αἶτ' ἄστοι τελέθωντ' αἰθ' ἑτεροπτόλιες·
 χῶτι με νύμφαν εὔσαν ἔχει τάφος, εἵπατε καὶ τό·
 χῶτι πατήρ μ' ἐκάλει Βαυκίδα, χῶτι γένος
 Τηλία, ὡς εἰδῶντι· καὶ ὅτι μοι ἅ συνεταιρίς
 Ἥρινν' ἐν τύμβῳ γράμμ' ἐχάραξε τόδε.

My stelae and Sirens and mournful urn, the very thing that holds these few ashes belonging to Hades, to those passing by my tomb say farewell, whether they be from my home town or from other cities; and tell that this tomb holds me, a bride; and this too that my father called me Baucis, and that my family is from Telos, so that they may know; and that my close friend Erinna engraved this epigram on my tomb.

The last line of this epigram, “Erinna engraved this epigram on my tomb,” clearly deploys the common epitaphic formula “X set me/this marker (*sema* or *mnēma*) up for Y.”²⁶ Stehle (2001) points out that in the fourth century an important shift in the conventions of poetic epitaphs can be observed vis-à-vis this formula. Prior to this period women only used this formula to set up poetic markers for sons who died young.²⁷ The lone exception, *CEG* 97 (late fifth century?), represents a woman, Euthylla, setting up a stele for a close friend, Biote.²⁸ In the subsequent period, however, the number of verse epitaphs set up by women using this formula increases significantly. Grieving mothers appear as co-rectors in most of the epigrams where the father is represented as

²⁶ On this formula in sixth and fifth century epitaphs see Lausberg (1982: 106–11).

²⁷ Stehle (2001: 180–1).

²⁸ Stehle (2001: 182) notes the similarity between the relationship of the women in *CEG* 97 to that between Erinna and Baucis.

grieving, explicitly or implicitly, for a son.²⁹ And whereas in the earlier period young women rarely received poetic epitaphs at all and none using this formula in which the bestower of the monument can be certainly identified as a woman, in the fourth century women appear as sole bestowers of monuments lamenting their unmarried daughters.³⁰ Oddly, in the fourth century no verse epitaphs set up by women for their female friends are found. The common thread, which is especially marked in all the verse epitaphs set up by women using this formula, is the expression of an authentic female perspective. They praise the deceased for their feminine virtues, beauty, domestic virtues and chaste life and express “the emotional impact of loss” more freely than before by evoking conventions of lamentation or using poetic language of suffering and ordinary vocabulary of grief and longing.³¹ The similarity between these genuine female voices lamenting the death of an unmarried woman in the public, male genre of epitaphic elegiacs and Erinna’s *Distaff* is evident. We can infer from Stehle’s arguments that Erinna’s poetic agenda is somehow caught up in this shift in epitaphic conventions.³² But it is the *Distaff*’s self-conscious engagement with the constraints of a male genre on an authentic female voice that sets it apart from these verse epitaphs.

The same self-consciousness is present in 1 GP which represents the deceased Baucis as instructing her tomb objects, (the Sirens, stelae and urn). It is significant that Baucis not only enjoins them what to say to passers-by about herself, but she also enjoins them to read the epitaphic formula identifying the monument’s bestower, i.e. Erinna. This reference to the poet not only merges Baucis with Erinna as human sources of the words relayed to the passers-by, but also the epitaph with the epigram as textual sources of the same words. It draws, moreover, attention to the disquieting way Erinna handles the conventions of this type of epitaph. Contrary to the conventions observed by Stehle in fourth century verse epitaphs, Erinna’s epigram 1 GP *does not lament* Baucis. Baucis enjoins her Sirens, stelae and urn *to inform* passers-by who she was “so that they may know,” rather than extolling her beauty and feminine virtues or urging them to provoke passers-by to pity her cruel

²⁹ Stehle (2001:182, n. 13) cites *CEG* 527, 629, 704, as good examples.

³⁰ Stehle (2001: 182–5) discusses *CEG* 591, 543, 686, 587.

³¹ Stehle (2001: 185).

³² On the connection between authentic female lamentation and the domestic sphere, see Stehle (2001: 182–5); Loraux (1987: 1–3) and Greene (2005: 140–2).

fate or feel vicarious grief at the loss experienced by her father, family and Erinna. In 1 GP, Baucis wants passers-by to know what she achieved in her short life; the most significant achievement is to receive an epitaph engraved by Erinna, her close friend. The unemotional content of the message suggests that just as heroes in epic seek *kleos* for their deeds as compensation for their death, so Baucis in this epigram seeks *kleos* as compensation for her death in similar “masculine” terms. But what she wants sung about herself is neither completely male nor female oriented. She wants to be commemorated as a bride and as Erinna’s friend, female oriented objectives, but she also wants to be commemorated as her father’s daughter and as a member of the Teleian community, male oriented objectives.³³

The reference to Erinna in the last line also deepens the significance of the other metapoetic elements of the epigram; in particular, the Sirens evoke several metapoetic associations at once. First, the cultural importance of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* implies that Homer’s representation of Sirens could hardly have been shut out of the minds of Erinna’s ancient readers. In the *Odyssey*, they are infamous for their dangerous song that lures the men who hear it to their deaths. At *Od.* 12.158–200, Odysseus, ventriloquizing the Sirens, claims that they boasted to him that they knew everything (ἴδμεν δ’ ὅσσα γένηται ἐπὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ, *Od.* 12.191). The implication, according to Odysseus’ representation of the Sirens, is that they set themselves up as rivals of the Muses, who are associated with *klea andrōn* in general and in the *Odyssey* specifically.³⁴ Even more interesting in this regard is Odysseus’s report that the Sirens offered to sing to him their version of the Trojan war (ἴδμεν γάρ τοι πάνθ’ ὅς’ ἐνὶ Τροίῃ εὐρείῃ / Ἀργεῖοι Τρῶές τε θεῶν ἰότητι μόγησαν, *Od.* 12.189–90). Given that all the references to the fall of Troy in the *Odyssey* in some way focused on Odysseus, it can be inferred that the Sirens’ version would be no different and that what they offered to sing to him was an “Odyssey” centering on his deeds at Troy.³⁵ However, Odysseus and the Homeric narrator represent the Sirens’ promise of unstinting *kleos* as a deception. From this male oriented perspective,

³³ For *kleos* as compensation for the hero’s death in the *Iliad* see Nagy (1979: 94–106).

³⁴ The repetition of ἴδμεν at the beginning of *Od.* 12.189 and 191 might evoke, for a later reader, Hesiod’s quotation of the Muses in the *Theogony* (27–8).

³⁵ Demodocus’ song about the sack of Troy which focuses on Odysseus’ role can also be read as another “Odyssey.” On the way the *Odyssey* redefines “the best of the Achaeans” to suit Odysseus, see Nagy (1979).

what the Sirens really promise is obliteration. Erinna's appropriation of the Sirens as Baucis' mouth-pieces alludes in an antiphrastic way to the Sirens in the *Odyssey*: the relationship between Baucis and the Sirens inverts the narratological relationship between Odysseus and the Sirens. Whereas Odysseus ventriloquizes their speech, Baucis commands them to speak in their own voices. From Baucis' perspective, the Sirens do not promise obliteration, but unstinting *kleos*.

Casting our intertextual net wider confirms that the reference to the Sirens reflects Erinna's metapoetic concern with the suppression or the de-authorization of authentic female voice in public, in particular the voice of the *parthenos*. Explicit in the conceit of the epigram is a comparison between Baucis and the Sirens (and Erinna) with Persephone and her companions, one of the prototypical maiden choruses. The Sirens' own association with Persephone, moreover, reinforces the comparison. According to the tradition reflected in Apollonius Rhodius (4.891–98), Ovid (*Met.* 5.551–63) and Hyginus (*Fab.* 141), the Sirens were Persephone's playmates before she was abducted by Hades.³⁶ Thus the image evoked by the apostrophe to the Sirens is that of a chorus of maidens who were once led by one outstanding girl whom they praise because she has been selected from the group and made a bride or whom they lament incessantly because she has been taken away by death.

It can hardly be coincidental then that the Sirens are invoked in performances of a *partheneion* and that Baucis invokes them to foreground her status as a bride. An important feature of the maiden song is the de-authorization of the authentic voice of the *parthenos* which has as its purpose to confer female oriented *kleos*, i.e., praise for her outstanding beauty and other virtues, on the girl who is about to leave the group. Thus, the invocation of the Sirens, the anti-Muses in the patriarchal culture, plays an important role in this de-authorization of *klea gunaikōn*.³⁷ The tension in the epigram between authorized and de-authorized voices and between male and female agenda is captured completely by the way the invocation of the Sirens places the passers-by/readers in

³⁶ These authors are most likely drawing on an earlier tradition that goes back at least as far as Hesiod. The scholia to A.R. 4.892 says that Apollonius is following Hesiod (= fr. 68 M-W) in calling the island of the Sirens Anthemoessa. Apollonius' language is also very close to Hes. 150.33 (= P. Oxy. 1358 fr. 2 col. i) which refers to the voice of Sirens; this suggest Apollonius is either conflating two passages or perhaps that he read Hes. fr. 68 somewhere after Hes. fr. 150.

³⁷ Stehle (1997: 71–110).

the position of “at-risk” sailors in ear-shot of their dangerous song.³⁸ Viewed in dialogue with the *Distaff*, moreover, this epigram can be seen as a similar attempt to circumvent the strictures of the patriarchal culture by adopting a transgendered voice.

The structure of 1 GP, in which a voice closely connected with Baucis enjoins a messenger to report her death, is repeated in 2 GP:

Νύμφας Βαυκίδος εἰμί· πολυκλαύταν δὲ παρέρπων
 στάλαν τῷ κατὰ γᾶς τοῦτο λέγοις Ἀΐδα·
 Βάσκανός ἐσσ', Αἶδα. τὰ δέ τοι καλὰ σάμαθ' ὀρώντι
 ὀμοτάταν Βαυκοῦς ἀγγελέοντι τύχαν,
 ὡς τὰν παῖδ', ὕμέναιος ἐφ' αἷς ἀείδετο πεύκαις,
 ταῖσδ' ἐπὶ καδεστὰς ἔφλεγε πυρκαϊᾷ·
 καὶ σὺ μέν, ὦ Ὑμέναιε, γάμων μολπαῖον ἀοιδᾶν
 ἐς θρήνων γοερὸν φθέγμα μεθαρμόσαο.

I belong to Baucis, the bride. You passing by her much lamented stele please say this to Hades below: “Hades, you are envious!” This fine lettering will tell you as you look upon the most cruel fate of Baucis that with the very torches over which the Hymen was sung, her father-in-law lit this girl’s funeral pyre; and you, Hymen, changed the wedding song into a mournful lamentation.

The two epigrams seem to be in an intertextual dialogue. Erinna’s engraved words mentioned in the previous epigram here become the source of information to the passers-by. The voice of this epigram, usually assumed to be the tomb itself, could be read as the chorus of Sirens, stelae and urn enjoined by Baucis to speak in the previous one. Indeed, the mention of stelae in both seems to be a self-reflexive way of linking the two epigrams in a dialogue. The stele in this epigram corresponds to the interlocutory reference to it in 1 GP. The opening declaration, “I belong to Baucis” (Νύμφας Βαυκίδος εἰμί, 1), which could just as easily be spoken by a plurality in unison as it could by an individual, picks up the addressees of 1 GP who also belong to Baucis: Στάλαι καὶ Σειρήνες ἐμαὶ καὶ πένθιμε κρωσσέ (1.1 GP). Nor does it seem coincidental that these echoes occur in the first lines and that both epigrams not only figure Baucis’ death as a comparandum to Hades’ abduction of Persephone, but also locate this figuration in the second lines. Moreover, the rebuke directed at Hades in this epigram explicates the reference in 1 GP to Hades as the possessor of Baucis’ ashes: Hades abducted Baucis just as he did

³⁸ Cf. Manwell (2005: 84–6).

Persephone. It seems reasonable to treat these epigrams as companion pieces and read their voices as responding to one another.³⁹

The voice in 2 GP fulfils—albeit only in part—the request of Baucis in 1 GP. 2 GP obeys Baucis’ instructions to identify the tomb as containing her remains. The very first words, Νύμφας Βαυκίδος εἰμί, answer Baucis’ instructions in 1.5–6 GP, ᾧτι με νύμφαν εὔσαν ἔχει τάφος, εἶπατε καὶ τό’/ᾧτι πατήρ μ’ ἐκόλει Βαυκίδα. Nevertheless, the voice of 2 GP is quite independent from 1 GP. Rather than just providing the passers-by with information (as one might expect from Baucis’ instructions in 1 GP), the voice takes a different attitude. It politely asks the passer-by to upbraid Hades for abducting Baucis, and then effectively reads the contents of “the epigram/epitaph,” which provides details of the funeral: Baucis’ death interrupted her wedding, her funeral followed close enough afterward that her father-in-law used the bridal torch to light the pyre, and the transition between the two types of ceremony was so sudden that wedding song seemed to have turned itself into a dirge. Within this “self-reading” is a surprising apostrophe to Hymen. Just as the passer-by is enjoined to upbraid Hades, so the voice itself upbraids Hymen for turning the wedding song into a dirge.⁴⁰ All three male figures are represented as agents in Baucis’ transformation from bride to corpse. Implicit in this tripartite paralleling of Hades, Hymen, and the Father-in-law is the intention of the embittered voice of this epigram to provoke an emotional response in the reader. What 2 GP expresses is the irrational rhetoric of grief in which anything or anyone who is perceived to have brought about or participated in the finality of the loss is constructed as blameworthy.⁴¹ It is tempting to see in 2 GP’s reading of itself to the passer-by a gendered “misreading” of the instructions of 1 GP. In other words, the voices of 2 GP, the Sirens and tomb-accoutrements, interpret Baucis’ instructions about what they should say to passers-by loosely and according to their own female subjectivity. Consequently, 2 GP produces a message that accords with their female voice: a lament for Baucis.

³⁹ These two epigrams were placed close to each other in the *AP*; this suggests that already in antiquity they were read as companion pieces. On companion pieces see Kirstein (2002).

⁴⁰ See Manwell (2005: 86) for some interesting observations on the dialogues that are set up in this epigram between stele and addressee, addressee and Hades, and the direct address to Hymenaios.

⁴¹ Blaming, bitterness and protest are hallmarks for female lament: see Alexiou (1974: 55–122); Caraveli (1986) and Foley (1993); for the contrast with commemoration see Greene (2005: 140–7).

On a metapoetic level, the self-consciousness of the two epigrams points to a disjunction between what Baucis wants the epitaph to say and what it actually says. In 1 GP, Baucis explicitly enjoins the Sirens, stelae (of which this “much lamented stele” is one, the other being the stele 2 GP is assumed to be written on) and urn to give her *kleos* not only for having achieved the status of “bride”, but more importantly for having Erinna as her friend. For by having them read the words, “Erinna engraved this epigram on my tomb,” Baucis effectively reconfigures her own memorial such that she becomes the kind of girl Erinna could lament in public. Yet unlike in the *Distaff* and 1 GP, Erinna is not mentioned at all in 2 GP, which actually laments Baucis in public. Erinna’s absence signifies that the injunction of *Aidōs* in the *Distaff* operates in 2 GP as well. Erinna cannot be present at the public lament for Baucis, not even as a name in a text.

In the third and final epigram attributed to Erinna, 3 GP, although the theme is no longer Baucis, it nevertheless engages the same issues concerning gendered voice that we have observed in her other extant work.

Ἐξ ἀταλᾶν χειρῶν τάδε γράμματα· λῶστε Προμαθεῦ,
 ἐντί καὶ ἄνθρωποι τὴν ὁμαλοῖ σοφίαν·
 ταύταν γοῦν ἐτύμως τὴν παρθένον ὅστις ἔγραψεν,
 αἱ καὶ δὴν ποτέθηκ’, ἥς κ’ Ἀγαθαρχὶς ὅλα.

From delicate hands are these figures! My good Prometheus, there exist humans on a level with you in artistry. Well this maiden at least he depicted truly, whoever he was; if he had but added a voice, Agatharchis would be complete!⁴²

Manwell observes that Erinna’s concern with female speech and its connection to her poetic “I” is present in the emphasis on endowing Agatharchis with a voice. The inadequacy of craftsmen like “Prometheus and his progeny” to provide images with voices implies the superiority of poet over visual artist since poetry can give a voice to a representation.⁴³

In addition to this implicit contrast, however, the epigram actually merges poet and visual artist, and this merger is facilitated by the way

⁴² We have adopted Manwell’s translation of *τάδε γράμματα* as “figures” here. As she suggests *τάδε γράμματα* can refer both to the portrait of Agatharchis and to the words of the epigram itself Manwell (2005: 86–90, with n. 24); cf. *AP* 7.710.8 (= Erinna 1.8 GP), cited above.

⁴³ A similar expression of the rivalry between poetry and visual art is clear in *Pi. Ne.5.1*.

gender is handled. First, as Gutzwiller points out, since the portrait artist can safely be assumed to be male (given the norms of the patriarchal culture that Erinna and her original readers inhabited), and since the adjective ἀταλῶν, “delicate,” is gendered feminine in Greek poetry, the description of the portrait artist’s hands as “delicate” implies a sharing of the quality between Agatharchis and that artist.⁴⁴ Thus the first line effectively feminizes the male portrait artist, and thereby introduces gender-switching as a theme of the epigram. Related to this effect is the ambiguity inherent in the claim that there are humans who equal Prometheus and in the anonymity of the portrait artist.

In a close linear reading of the epigram, it does not become evident until the last line that the epigram is a comment on the skill of the portrait artist. The first hexameter breaks neatly into two parts: Ἐξ ἀταλῶν χειρῶν τάδε γράμματα· | λῶστέ Προμαθεῦ. The deictic force and primary meaning of τάδε γράμματα sets up the first-time linear reader who is familiar with the conventions of literary epigrams to interpret the first part of the line as a play on the common conceit of the epigram trying to get the reader/passers-by’s attention. In this case the trick seems to be an attempt at a kind of “product differentiation”; the speaker of the epigram (which could be the epigram itself) advertises, as it were, that this epigram, unlike the ones the reader is used to, was written by delicate hands, i.e., by a woman. The apostrophe after the bucolic diaeresis reorients the statement by identifying the imagined reader as Prometheus; a switch from the human to the divine has also taken place. The reader is not the intended target of the comment on the hands of epigram’s creator; rather, Prometheus is invoked to judge for himself how much like his own skill is the skill of the epigrammatist.

Prometheus, traditionally associated with the creation of human beings (e.g., Apollod. 1.45.2–4), is also associated with the invention of writing. In *Prometheus Bound*, the title-character declares that the invention of writing (γραμμάτων συνθέσεις) was among the many gifts to humanity for which he is being punished by Zeus unfairly (*PV* 460–61). According to Prometheus γράμμάτων συνθέσεις are identified with memory, the source of poetry (μουσομήτορ). On a linear reading, the σοφία mentioned in the first pentameter can be interpreted as writing

⁴⁴ See Gutzwiller (2002a: 88–9) for discussion of the gendered quality of the adjective.

poetry. Thus the reference to Prometheus does not necessarily provoke the reader to reorient toward portrait painting yet.

The crucial switch, i.e., the medium-switch, occurs in the hexameter of the second couplet. But once again the switch is delayed until after the bucolic diaeresis. Before that point in the hexameter, *ταύταν γοῦν ἐτύμως τὰν παρθένον* could be the subject of an indirect statement implied by *τάδε γράμματα*: “By delicate hands were written these words—O my good Prometheus, there exist humans on a level with you in skill (at writing poetry)—saying that this maiden truly...” In this linear reading, before the bucolic diaeresis has been reached, the “maiden” picks up “delicate” and suggests Erinna herself is the maiden. After the bucolic diaeresis Erinna is still the source of astonishment, but now as composer of the words. It is not until the last line when the wish that the artist had added a voice that it becomes absolutely clear that *τάδε γράμματα* does not mean “epigram” but “portrait” and that *ἔγραψεν* does not mean “write” but “depict.” When the latent meaning is finally activated, the whole poem needs to be re-interpreted; no longer can it be read as a comment on “the words of the poetess”, but it must be read as a comment on the workmanship of the anonymous male portrait artist—another gender-switch. This linear reading intensifies the metapoetic impact of the final pentameter which observes that if the portrait artist had added a voice to Agatharchis, she would be complete. The portrait artist replaces the poetess, just as the portrait replaces the epigram. And just like the Agatharchis in the portrait, the epigram seems to be without a true female voice. In the end, however, the epigram does in fact speak about itself. Through the act of reading, the epigram is ultimately transformed in the linear readers’ minds from a poem written with “delicate” (i.e. female) hands to one that critiques the skill of a male portrait artist’s handling—scil. omission—of female voice.

In Erinna’s epigrams, a self-conscious play between gender and genre is operative. In all three, the authentic female voice seeks expression indirectly, by authorizing other de-authorized female voices to commemorate (i.e., perform a male function) Baucis (i.e., a female figure who has been denied lamentation) (1 GP), or by representing female voices defiantly reading Erinna’s unsanctioned lament for Baucis to passers-by without attributing the words to the poetess (2 GP), or by playing with the readers’ expectations in order to demonstrate how authentic female voice is suppressed by male art (3 GP). In every case, the female voice is framed by something male, and the result is an overarching

transgendered voice which is Erinna's contribution to Hellenistic poetics. Erinna's influence on gendered voice, whether acknowledged or not by subsequent Hellenistic poets, was considerable. As the first poet known to represent in a self-conscious manner an authentic female voice in hexameter and elegy, Erinna changed the poetic stakes.

Nossis and Anyte

Nossis and Anyte give the best impression of the new poetic playing field for gendered voices. Much of the recent scholarship on these two poets has been devoted to describing the way both infused their epigrams with a genuine feminine perspective as part of their literary aims.⁴⁵ The fact that they also wrote epigrams from a male perspective has posed a challenge for scholars who seek to establish Anyte's and (to a lesser extent) Nossis' poetic voice as distinctly feminine. Several scholars have tried to explain away the obviously male-voiced epigrams by highlighting that they often present an idiosyncratic perspective *vis-à-vis* the values of patriarchal culture. These arguments, however, implicitly set up a somewhat false equation between idiosyncratic perspectives and authentic feminine perspectives. Whereas it is true that the male-gendered epigrams of Nossis and Anyte do not merely reproduce the dictates of the patriarchal culture, their masculinity cannot be so easily dismissed; by the same token, expressions of a masculine or patriarchal culture do not necessarily threaten a distinctly feminine poetic voice—it depends on whether the masculine perspective is endorsed or problematized.⁴⁶ Hence, it is our contention that their male-gendered poems participate self-consciously in the transgendered poetics inaugurated by Erinna.

Nossis chose the male genre of dedicatory epigram to express a self-conscious woman-centered voice. Skinner's arguments have emphasized Nossis' affiliation with Sappho in the construction of her authentic female poetic voice, especially in her metapoetic epigrams (*AP* 5.170 = 1 GP; *AP* 7.718 = 11 GP).⁴⁷ Gutzwiller extends Skinner's argument by

⁴⁵ On Anyte: Arthur (1980); Gutzwiller (1992a); Greene (2005). On Nossis see: Skinner (1987), (1989), (1991), and (2005); Gutzwiller (1997a: 211–22), (1998: 74–88).

⁴⁶ For discussion of this point in relation to Sappho, see Winkler (1981: 68–9).

⁴⁷ Skinner (1989), (1991), (2005); see also Snyder (1989: 77–86); Furiani (1991); Williamson (1995: 18–20); Gutzwiller (1997a: 211–22) and (1998: 74–88) argues convincingly for these two epigrams standing at the beginning and end of the collection that Nossis published as a book.

pointing out that Erinna is an equally important literary ancestor: Nossis' self-conscious use of Sappho's persona as her model also involves a similar use of Erinna's persona; for Nossis Sappho's persona, the erotic *gynē*, stands in contradistinction to Erinna's persona, the self-restrained *parthenos*.⁴⁸ In addition, Erinna's innovative melding of masculinity and femininity also informs Nossis' female voice as the quality that helps distinguish it from that the erotic quality of Sappho. This is evident in Nossis' masculine dedicatory epigram 2 GP (= AP 6.132):

Ἔντεα Βρέττιοι ἄνδρες ἅπ' αἰνομόρων βάλλον ὤμων
 θεινόμενοι Λοκρῶν χερσὶν ὑπ' ὠκυμάχων,
 ὧν ἄρετὰν ὑμνεῦντα θεῶν ὑπ' ἀνάκτορα κεῖνται,
 οὐδὲ ποθεῦντι κακῶν πάχεας, οὐς ἔλιπον.

Bruttian men cast these weapons from their ill-fated shoulders as they were being smitten by the hands of fast fighting Locrians whose valor they sing lying in the temple of the gods, and they do not long for the arms of the cowards whom they left behind.

Skinner (2005: 122–3) fits the masculinity of this epigram into what she considers to be Nossis' overarching idiosyncratic perspective with respect to patriarchal culture. She also perceives a significant contrast between this epigram and Anyte's masculine epigrams. According to Skinner, whereas Anyte's epigrams are consistent with the values of the patriarchal culture and valorize even the defeated warrior, Nossis' voice reviles the defeated Bruttians and combines patriotism with disgust toward the heroic code's "equivocal operations."⁴⁹ Idiosyncratic as this epigram's perspective may be *vis-à-vis* more traditional treatments of the heroic code, the voice of the epigram is still masculine. Gutzwiller (1998b: 80) is closer to the truth; she suggests that Nossis is ventriloquizing the sentiments of the enemies' weapons (ὑμνεῦντα, 3). Yet, shifting the source of the male perspective from men to their weapons does not change the fact that the epigram's voice is male and that the idiosyncratic perspective of this epigram does not reflect a subjectivity that is defiant toward the heroic code.

The authentic masculine voice is not so simple, moreover; it can accommodate a variety in its expression. For even a defiant attitude

⁴⁸ Gutzwiller (1997a: 211–22) and (1998b: 77–8, 86–7). According to Gutzwiller (1998b: 87 (= 1997: 220)), "Nossis rejects the role of the sacrificial maiden, and offers as an alternative the Sapphic perspective of an adult woman speaking about women to a primary audience of women."

⁴⁹ Skinner (2005: 123).

toward the heroic code can still be masculine. This is evident in a famous elegiac quatrain of Archilochus to which this epigram certainly alludes.

ἀσπίδι μὲν Σαίων τις ἀγάλλεται, ἦν παρὰ θάμνῳ,
 ἔντος ἀμώμητον, κάλλιπον οὐκ ἐθέλων·
 αὐτὸν δ' ἐξεσάωσα. τί μοι μέλει ἀσπὶς ἐκείνη;
 ἐρρέτω· ἐξαυτίς κτήσομαι οὐ κακίω.

Some Saian exults in my shield which by a bush, a blameless weapon,
 I left behind against my will. But I saved myself. What do I care about
 that shield? To hell with it! I'll get another one that's no worse.

(Archilochus fr. 5 W)

Archilochus here undercuts the heroic code from the perspective of a mercenary whose shocking concept of valor is linked to possessions rather than to courage in the face of death. The idiosyncratic perspective that Skinner detects in Nossis' epigram, we argue, is a by-product of the allusive engagement with Archilochus' persona. The vaunt of Locrian warriors that the Bruttians' shields sing picks up the vaunt of the Saian warrior that Archilochus' persona imagines. Moreover, Archilochus' attempt to deflect censure by saying, ἔντος ἀμώμητον, κάλλιπον οὐκ ἐθέλων, is answered both by Nossis' first couplet reviling the Bruttians for casting away their shields, and by the last line praising the shields for abandoning such cowards. The allusion implies that if the shields in Nossis' poem are so disgusted with the Bruttians for throwing them away in the heat of battle that they now sing the praises of the Locrians, then the shield in Archilochus' poem must be even more disgusted with his persona's cowardly behavior. Indeed, Nossis' last line implies a clever retort to Archilochus' last line: "Yes you can buy another shield that is no worse, but blameless shields eventually abandon cowards like you!" Recognizing the intertextual relationship between Nossis' epigram and Archilochus' poem makes it clear that the target of the over-the-top censure is Archilochus' poetic persona, which expresses itself not only by flaunting the heroic code, as in this epigram, but primarily through hyper-masculine invective.⁵⁰ We suggest that Nossis' epigrams set up a battle of poetic personae in which

⁵⁰ The fact that Archilochus sometimes aimed his invective against women by impugning their chastity, as in his poem against the daughters of Lycambes (fr. 38 W), suggests that Nossis' engagement with his poetic persona in this epigram is related to her own choice of an erotic adult female persona.

she fights fire with fire, attacking Archilochus' Achilles' heel, as it were, *vis-à-vis* the heroic code. Thus Nossis' epigram does reflect an idiosyncratic perspective, albeit not one that is feminine or even deviant from the patriarchal culture, but one that is hyper-masculine and aggressively supportive of the heroic code.

Nevertheless, this hyper-masculine voice has a pitch that is a bit too high. Nossis' engagement with the traditional male perspective is perceptably self-reflexive and problematizing. The last line of the epigram leaves the reader with an erotic metaphor which compares the shields to disillusioned lovers: οὐδὲ ποθεῦντι κακῶν πάχεας, οὐς ἔλιπον. Such a switch from a martial to an erotic tone is a well recognized gender switch, from male to female.⁵¹ Moreover, since Nossis distinguishes her persona from Erinna's by assuming that of an erotic adult woman, this subtle switch in the invective to the erotic in the last line makes audible Nossis' female voice through the epigram's hyper-masculine persona.

Anyte's masculine epigrams pose an even greater challenge since they seem to represent an unconscious reflex of the conventions of the male genre. Indeed, several scholars have argued that these poems reflect the concerns and subjectivity of patriarchal culture.⁵² Ellen Greene (2005), however, illustrates how Anyte self-consciously manipulates the tension between gendered voice and gendered genre in her female epigrams: her poems often maintain several tensions at once, i.e., objective versus personal, public versus private, male versus female. Following Gutzwiller's (1998b: 60) conclusions about Anyte's epitaphs for young women, Greene notes that they often express an authentic female perspective that focuses on the mother-daughter relationship, and agrees with Gutzwiller's insightful observation that as a group, these epitaphs form "a chorus" of lamenting female voices—grieving mothers, dying daughters, and Anyte herself.⁵³

However, incorporating D. Geoghegan's comments on the epigrams, Greene also observes that this feminine perspective is often informed by allusions to Homeric laments which put the "lived experiences

⁵¹ Sappho fr. 16 LP = fr. 16 V. is the *locus classicus* for the gendered nature of this switch from martial to erotic.

⁵² Wright (1923); von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1924: 1.136); Skinner (2005: 113, 123) contrasts Nossis with Anyte, arguing the her masculine epigrams are conventional.

⁵³ Greene (2005: 144–5); cf. Gutzwiller (1998b: 60).

of women into dialogue with the male heroic tradition.”⁵⁴ Within a collection of Anyte’s epigrams, this dialogue between masculine and feminine perspectives in the female gendered epigrams, we argue, would have been writ large for the ancient reader. In fact, any collection of Anyte’s epigrams, whether produced by the poet herself or an anthologist, would make this dialogue between the masculine- and feminine-gendered epigrams evident. Moreover, there is an obvious point of contact between Anyte’s feminine epigrams and Erinna’s poetry: both appropriate Homeric *goos* and give it an authentic female perspective. The inclusion of male voiced poems in the collection augments the gendered tension within the female poems and seems to provide further evidence that Anyte participates in the self-conscious transgendered poetics that we attribute to Erinna. Erinna’s influence may be lurking here even if Anyte does not seem to acknowledge it explicitly.

As a closing example, it is worth examining 21 GP (= AP 7.232) because it clearly demonstrates that her masculine voice is *not* a reflex of the conventions of the epitaphic genre. Instead it shows that in these epigrams Anyte has made a self-conscious choice to impersonate an authentic masculine voice.

Λύδιον οὐδας ἔχει τόδ’ Ἀμύντορα, παῖδα Φιλίππου,
 πολλὰ σιδηρεῖς χερσὶ θιγόντα μάχης·
 οὐδέ μιν ἀλγινόεσσα νόσος δόμον ἄγαγε Νυκτός,
 ἀλλ’ ὄλετ’ ἀμφ’ ἐτάρῳ σχὼν κυκλόεσσαν ἵτον.

The Lydian ground has Philippus’ son, Amyntor, who touched iron battle with his hands many times. It wasn’t painful disease that led him to the house of Night, but rather he was destroyed holding his circular shield over his comrade.

(Anyte 21 GP)

Although it is not explicit, the reference to Amyntor’s father strongly suggests that he is the imagined speaker. Moreover, the theme of a glorious death in battle shows clearly that the subjectivity is masculine. Self-consciousness can be detected in the contrast the speaker makes between the way Amyntor actually died, i.e., on the battlefield, and the way he could have died but did not, i.e., in a sickbed. It is significant that the counterfactual scenario is figured as a marriage in which Disease led Amyntor *like a bride* to the house of Night. This implies that if Amyntor had died in a sick bed his death would have been “girly”;

⁵⁴ Greene (2005: 145); Geoghegan (1979: 73).

Hades' rape of Persephone and Demeter's consequent grief clearly inform this alternate vision of Amyntor's death. But it can hardly be accidental that the rape of Persephone, a topos in epitaphs set up by mothers for their daughters who died before marriage, is also used by Anyte herself in 5 GP (= *AP* 7.486), another epitaphic epigram in which a mother Cleina bewails the untimely death of her daughter Philaenis at her tomb.⁵⁵ The allusion to the rape of Persephone in both the male epigram for Amyntor and the female epigram for Philaenis sets up an intertextual relationship between the two poems, one that contrasts the way fathers mourn their sons with the way mothers mourn their daughters. Moreover, since the allusion in the male epigram is part of the counterfactual scenario, there is the further implication that had he been overtaken by illness, Amyntor would have been mourned the way a girl would be mourned by her mother. The masculine voice of this epigram occludes an alternate feminine subjectivity. Thus the apparently superfluous claim about how he did not die seems to respond to questions about Amyntor's masculinity. For the message is not merely that Amyntor died like a man, but that he died like a man, and not like a girl! The occlusion of the feminine perspective moreover gives significance to the conventional reference to his father by highlighting the epigram's silence about his mother. By the fourth century, as noted above, it became common practice for epitaphs mourning the death of a son to bear reference to both parents.⁵⁶ The omission of a reference to Amyntor's mother is not a reflex of the epitaphic conventions, then, but is a self-conscious throw back to an earlier style of epitaphs where mothers were not mentioned. Furthermore, it implies a contrast between paternal and maternal expressions of grief. So the epigram, in addition to emphasizing the masculinity of Amyntor, also emphasizes the masculinity of the voice commemorating his death: Amyntor died like a *real* man, not like a girl, and I commemorate him in the good old fashioned manly manner, without reference to his mother and all that feminine, maternal, Demeter-like mourning. Anyte demonstrates not a passive adherence to the generic conventions, but an active choice to create a poetic persona that can "pass" as authentically masculine.

⁵⁵ Greene (2005: 142) discusses the allusion to the rape of Persephone in 5 GP (= *AP* 7.486). For the Demeter and Persephone myth as emblematic of female lament, especially mothers lamenting their daughters' premature death, see Foley (1994: 123).

⁵⁶ Stehle (2001: 182, n. 13) points out *CEG* 527, 629, 704 as good examples of the new trend.

Anyte can do so because, as stated at the start of this chapter, the pairing of gender and genre in the Hellenistic age was no longer tied to conventions of performance. Rather, Anyte's use here of a transgendered voice responds to possibilities opened up by the Hellenistic book culture and the rise of epigram collections. These deepened the divide between poet and poetic voice. To be sure, epigrams, because they are texts, especially those inscribed anonymously on monuments or grave markers, had always engaged with the potentialities of the independent voice. The textuality of literary epigram in particular, however, emancipated the gendered voice, creating new space for experimentation.

CHARACTERIZATION IN HELLENISTIC EPIGRAM

Graham Zanker

It might seem paradoxical to expect to find characterization in poems which have such a small compass as Hellenistic epigrams. Yet in certain sub-branches of the genre, especially in the early period, the very brevity of the format appears to have been felt as a challenge to authors to give the speaker as vividly characterized a persona as possible. There is no systematic treatment of this aspect of Hellenistic epigram, and the following essay attempts to open up a neglected field.

It is important that we understand precisely in what ways the Hellenistic period understood what we call characterization. Aristotle's *Poetics* is particularly enlightening for the late-classical background to Hellenistic thinking. In Chapter Six Aristotle states that in the composition of tragedy the people involved in the action must have certain moral and intellectual characteristics for the audience to be able to judge their actions (49b36–50a7); the representation of character (ἦθος) reveals the moral choices made by the figures in the play, and the representation of intellect (διάνοια) denotes their ability to say what the situation involves and requires, or to make general statements relevant to the situation (50a38–50b12). Modern sensitivity demands that characterization include the emotional element, which Aristotle accommodates when he describes how the tragedian should represent character in Chapter Fifteen: a figure's character (n.b. ἐπὶ τῶν ἠθῶν) may be lifelike and contain negative traits like proneness to anger, laziness and so forth, but should be portrayed as morally good (54b8–15). It should not be thought that since Aristotle calls plot the “soul” of tragedy at 50a38 he would necessarily give secondary importance to character in all genres of poetry: the pre-eminence he gives to plot in tragedy is conditioned by his tenet that tragedy is primarily a representation of an action (49b24), and that a plot is conceivable in tragedy without character (50a23–9, 50a39–50b3). Elsewhere, he enthusiastically applauds Homer for the way he introduces the people in his epics by letting them speak and act for themselves, so that they all are “full of character” (καὶ οὐδέν' ἀήθη ἄλλ' ἔχοντα ἦθος, 60a5–11). Of course, he preceded the developments in epigram in the Hellenistic period, but

he would hardly have imposed his framework for tragedy on the genre, and would have allowed that epigram might indeed depict character as one of its prominent aims.

Clearly, then, the concept of characterization was well recognised in the literary criticism just preceding the Hellenistic age. A single word to denote the concept was longer in the making. An important development is the appearance of the word ἡθοποιία, in the first century B.C., in the latter half of the period covered in this book. Strabo 14.1.41 tells us how a citizen of Magnesia, Cleombrotus, corrupted the melic style of poetry by imitating the dialects and ἡθοποιία of the cinaedi. This could mean something like characterization, or it might just refer to mannerisms popular among the cinaedi. More interesting is the passage in the *On Poetry* of Philodemus (col. ix 10–24) which reports the view of scholars who consider that the best poet is the one who is equally equipped in the construction of plot, in characterization (ταῖς ἄλλαις ἡθοποιίαις), and in diction. Philodemus admits that this view has some sense, but complains that it does not define what is a “best poet,” for a mime-writer, a historian or any other prose-writer could demonstrate the same abilities. Philodemus therefore makes it perfectly clear that Hellenistic critics used ἡθοποιία in the context of poetry, and that it meant something close to the modern reference of “characterization.”¹ Philodemus’ interest in characterization is all the more interesting if we accept the identification with the epigrammatist of Philip’s *Garland*,² one of the most vivid characterizers of all the later Hellenistic epigrammatists.³

ἡθοποιία is in fact most frequently associated with rhetoric, where it refers to the speechwriter’s skill in creating for his client a persona which has, for example, moral worth (ἐπιείκεια), for such a persona is most likely to inspire trust in his listeners.⁴ But, as we have seen, ἡθοποιία is not limited to the specific meaning ascribed to it by the rhetoricians.⁵ Indeed, by the Imperial period, the Greek rhetors define ἡθοποιία in very much the way in which we would talk of characterization. Hermogenes, for instance, calls it “the representation of a person’s

¹ For the context see Porter (1995: 120–3).

² Gow-Page (1968: 2.372–4). For the relationship of Philodemus’ literary criticism and his own epigrams see now Sider (1997: 28–39).

³ See below, n. 45.

⁴ Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1.2.4; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Lysias* 8, *Isocrates* 11. See in general Hagen (1966: 1–39), and Russell (1990) for a summary of the evidence and for examples of oratorical characterization.

⁵ Though e.g. Usher (1974: 33, n. 3) insists on the contrary.

character,” using the example of what Andromache would have said over the body of Hector.⁶

Dirk Obbink has recently introduced a second word of possible relevance to characterization in poetry, drawing it from the New Posidippus, specifically from the title of the series of the texts and fragments of eight poems in which the deceased speaks from the grave and reveals his or her character (col. 15.23–col. 16.17 = 102–9 AB). The poems are placed in the section entitled *τρόποι*. Obbink concludes that *τρόποι* “are generic ‘turns’ or stereotyped ‘adaptations’ of characterizable ways of speaking.”⁷ This fits certain of the poems admirably, in particular 102–4 AB, though perhaps 105 AB does not fit Obbink’s format so well, being an address (not necessarily from the deceased) to the onlooker to pronounce some kind of blessing.⁸ But the term, thus defined, will not cover all aspects of characterization, and there are as we shall see many Posidippian epigrams which are full of character and come from other sections in the Milan roll.

The Classical and Hellenistic periods, therefore, did have a terminology for characterization in poetry. But the techniques of characterization used in practice and theory are also important for our study of Hellenistic epigram. It is well known that New Comedy characterized by taking a stereotype, for which there were appropriate masks, and then proceeded to individualize its people by superimposing individual details on to the type.⁹ For its part, too, rhetoric used typical characterization, as is clear from the discussion of character types in Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*, especially 2.12–7 and 3.7.6–7,¹⁰ and Quintilian was later to make the connection between comic and rhetorical characterization explicit.¹¹ We shall find this a very common practice among the Hellenistic

⁶ *Progymnasmata* 9; see also e.g. Aphthonius, *Progymnasmata* 11, Nicolaus Sophistes, *Progymnasmata* 11. See especially Hagen (1966: 55–69).

⁷ Obbink (2004b: 298), though there are better instances of the use of *τρόποι* to mean “character” than the first section of the probably spurious prologue to Theophrastus’ *Characters*: see e.g. Menander, *Hymnis* 407.7 Körte-Thierfelder (1959: 144), Isocrates, *Evagoras* 24, 51, 75.

⁸ Krevans (2005: 93–4) has pertinent remarks on this kind of trailing-off: “Two basic principles govern the sequencing of poems with sections in this collection, both variants of the command ‘keep like with like.’ The first principle is to keep poems on similar topics adjacent to each other,” and “The second principle this editor seems to follow is: keep items which best match the section titles at the head of the section; place items whose connection is less clear at the end of the section.”

⁹ See e.g. Hunter (1985: 59–113).

¹⁰ See Hagen (1966: 30–6).

¹¹ *Institutio Oratoria* 3.8.51: see Hagen (1966: 80–2).

epigrammatists, and comedy is likely to have been very influential in this respect. For Hellenistic epigram, balancing type and individual in the presentation of character is just as much an art as inventing variations on stock themes. In fact, the two procedures are analogous.

Having briefly¹² ascertained what the Hellenistic period looked for in characterization, and having established that there is substantial overlap with what we understand by the term, we can begin our analysis of the phenomenon in Hellenistic epigram.

I begin with the dedicatory poems. The period of high Hellenism sees the introduction of characterization in this branch of epigram to a degree quite inconceivable in the Classical age. This is true of certain dedications by individuals who wish to express gratitude for success in their personal lives. A fascinating example of this kind of epigram is Hedylus 2 GP (= AP 5.199):

Οἶνος καὶ προπόσεις κατεκοίμισαν Ἀγλαονίκην
αἱ δόλιαι, καὶ ἔρως ἡδὺς ὁ Νικαγόρεω,
ἥς πάρα Κύπριδι ταῦτα μύροις ἔτι πάντα μυδῶντα
κεῖνται, παρθενίων ὕγρα λάφυρα πόθων,
σάνδαλα καὶ μαλακὰ μαστῶν ἐκδύματα μίτραι,
ὑπνου καὶ σκυλμῶν τῶν τότε μαρτύρια.

Wine and toasts lulled Aglaonice to sleep,
treacherous things, and her sweet love for Nicagoras;
from her to Cyprus all these things still damp with perfumes
are dedicated, moist spoils of a maiden's passion,
sandals and the soft girdles, stripped from her breasts,
as evidence of their sleep and rough play that time.

This poem, a mixture of the dedicatory and amatory epigram-types, vividly conveys Aglaonice's and Nicagoras' steamy night and Aglaonice's contentment by means of the objects dedicated and the state they are said to be in. There seems to be some ambivalence on Aglaonice's part. She is presented on the one hand as notably passive in her submission: she has succumbed to one too many love-toasts, her clothes are "spoils," her girdle has been "stripped" off her body, and her lovemaking with

¹² For further discussion of character, personality and characterization in Greek poetry in general see Süß (1910), Solmsen (1941), Hagen (1966), Corts (1968), Chamberlain (1984), the essays in Pelling (1990), Braet (1992), the essays by Baumlin and Baumlin, Swearingen, Kinneavy and Warshauer, Enos and Schnakenberg, and Hughes in Baumlin and Baumlin (1994), Lausberg (1998: 366–70, 495–6, 498), Worman (2002: 31–5). For the possible use of Theophrastus' *Characters* as a source book for characterization in rhetoric see Fortenbaugh (1994).

Nicagoras seems to have involved some violence, as is suggested by the word σκυλμός (my “rough play”). On the other hand, her love for Nicagoras was something which was “sweet” and the fact of her maidenly passion is made explicit, so to some extent she may have gone along with her undoing, or have been robbed of something she would have given freely.¹³ The ambivalence may have dictated the striking impersonality of the dedication, behind which we can supplement her mood and character. Aglaonice thus changes from the type of a girl in love into a complex, individualized being. In fact, the poem may well be a companion-piece to another soulful poem that we will touch on at greater length below, Asclepiades 18 GP (= *AP* 12.135). The speaker deduces that a fellow-symposiast—named Nicagoras—is in love from the evidence of his wine-consumption and the frequent toasts that he is making.¹⁴ If the connection is real, and it seems very likely to be, we can see Hedylus filling out Asclepiades’ picture, and simultaneously depending on it for the full effect that he intends in his own poem, especially in terms of his characterization of Aglaonice: his Aglaonice’s mood of (perhaps resigned) fulfilment is a precise contrast with that of Nicagoras’ longing in Asclepiades’ epigram, and yet Nicagoras now seems to have resolved his earlier predicament.¹⁵

This kind of characterization is hardly confined to the world of the enthusiastic amateur, but is also illustrated in many epigrams at least purportedly by retiring professionals. In fact, some of the most striking instances of characterization in the epigrams of the Hellenistic period deal with hetaerae and entertainers, and these poems are valuable testimony to the age’s fascination with women and in particular women on the margins of society.¹⁶ Hetaerae formed a stock type in Middle and New Comedy,¹⁷ and this fact may have influenced both the popularity of poems on them and the characterization of them. The poem on the hetaera Plango by either Asclepiades (35 GP = *AP* 5.202) or,

¹³ See further Pretagostini (2000).

¹⁴ The poems begin with the same word, “wine”; their opening couplets each contain “wine” and “toasts” and the name Nicagoras; the “toasts” are qualified by article and adjective combinations (αἱ πολλάί~αἱ δόλῳ). Hedylus 6 GP praises Asclepiades explicitly, and the poet shared Samian connections: see Gow-Page (1965: 2.289), who feel it “probable that he was appreciably [Asclepiades’] junior.”

¹⁵ This connection makes the poem an instance of Hellenistic intertextuality that would repay further analysis. Cf. the poems on gluttons like Leonidas 56 GP, which emulate one another by individualizing the type in ever new ways.

¹⁶ Neumer-Pfau (1982).

¹⁷ See in general Hunter (1985: 92–5).

more likely, Posidippus (127 AB) is a good case in point.¹⁸ Plango dedicates her purple whip and gleaming reins at the entrance of a temple of Aphrodite in celebration of her victory over the experienced Philaenis, in all probability the authoress of the treatise on sexual positions,¹⁹ in a competition as “jockeys” “when the colts were just beginning to neigh in the evening.” In language that reminds us ironically of authentic epinician poetry, Plango prays that the goddess will grant the true glory of the victory by making sure the offering is remembered forever. Plango’s exuberant personality and pride of achievement are impressively conveyed, and the naming of a well known figure like Philaenis further individualizes the poem.²⁰ Or take a less sexually aggressive and humorous piece like Leonidas’ poem on the two sisters who were “easy-going workers of the Muses” (43 GP = AP 5.206). They have dedicated their musical instruments after outgrowing their profession as musicians; the amorous (φίλερως, 5) Satyre has offered up her syrinx, “her fellow evening reveller for drinking parties, sweetly playing on which far into the night she saw the dawn as she knocked on courtyard doors” in serenades (5–8). Here it emerges that at least Satyre enjoyed her profession, and her conviviality is beautifully evoked. But even professionals can have an off day, and the poem by “Plato” on the famous Corinthian courtesan Lais (8 FGE = AP 6.1), in which she dedicates her mirror to Aphrodite because she cannot bear to see her face any more, neatly brings out the melancholy of a beauty once so proud and now at the end of her career.

But males too can retire, and Phanias has two pieces which read much like Leonidas’ lists of tools of trade; but Phanias uses the tools to characterize his dedicators. In one, poem 2 GP (= AP 6.294), a schoolteacher named Callon, whose “body is bound by old age and exhaustion” (6), dedicates to Hermes the staff he used to beat his charges about their temples, the flogging strap and the cane he kept by his side

¹⁸ Gow-Page (1965: 2.140) regard the ascription to Posidippus as the more probable; so also most recently Austin and Bastianini (2002: 164), who, without giving their reasons, assign Asclepiades 35 GP to Posidippus 127 AB.

¹⁹ See Gow-Page (1965: 2.4), on Aeschryon 1 GP; note also Dioscorides 26 GP.

²⁰ See also the companion piece, Asclepiades 6 GP, on Lysidice’s skill with a spur (at Zanker (1987: 163–4 and 216, n. 22), I offered a solution to the question of her position on her client) and Phalaecus 1 GP, on Cleo’s gratitude to Dionysus for the way she shone at a symposium.

in the classroom, a supple shoe and a sandal, and the covering for his sparsely-haired pate. The picture objectively emerging from the list is one of a sadistic old curmudgeon indeed. The poem is one in which a typical characterization, here that of the brutal schoolmaster (like Lampriscus in Herodas' third *Mimiamb*), is individualized by the cumulative detail of his cruel inducements to discipline. This is an approach to characterization that we saw inherent in the stock characters of the rhetorical treatises, Theophrastus in the *Characters*, and New Comedy. In the other epigram (Phanias 3 GP = AP 6.295), a scribe named Acestondas dedicates to the Muses the tools of his trade, which are listed in minute detail, his pen, penknife, eraser, paper-weight, ruler, inkpot and so on—all because he has been promoted to a job in a taxation or customs office, which he considers the lap of luxury after his poverty as a mere scribe. The list of office equipment turns out to be a gloating farewell to every trace of his former existence. The dedicator in this poem is more individualized than Callon the schoolmaster, given the specificity of the career-change and the sense of glee and release that it has awoken in Acestondas. The joys of promotion can seldom have been captured so wittily.

A group of epigrams on another type of career-change is interesting, because the poems respond to one another very largely on the character and circumstances of the dedicators. I refer to the pieces in which women turn from the honest profession of weaving to the life of a hetaera. Antipater of Sidon 43 GP (= AP 6.47) has Bitto dedicating to Athene her shuttle, "an implement of her hunger-bringing trade," and telling the goddess to accept the offering, because she is giving up weaving as a widow of forty years, having discovered that "desire is stronger than her age." Nicarchus' counter-piece (2 GP = AP 6.285) introduces Nicarete setting fire to her weaving basket and yarn spools as an offering to Aphrodite, complaining about the profession, which she says merely "wastes away a young flower" (6); she prefers the delights of the symposium and the revels that follow, and promises the goddess a tithe of her takings if she'll accept the offering of her old trade and give her the new one in exchange. Nicarete is a young woman, in contradistinction to Bitto, and has a different motivation for turning hetaera: she wants to enjoy her youth, and weaving is not quite the social outlet she needs. Both poems characterize their respective dedicators in a vivid way, from two perspectives, and again demonstrate

the technique of characterizing by grafting individual character-traits on a stereotype.²¹

Offerings to Aphrodite are not the exclusive preserve of courtesans and the like, as a lovely piece by Theocritus shows (2 GP = AP 6.340 = 13 Gow = 13 Rossi). It opens with the emphatic denial that the statue before the onlooker is of Cypris πάνδαμος, “of the people;” rather, one should call the goddess οὐρανίαν, “celestial,” an offering by “chaste” Chrysogena in the household of Amphicles her husband, because Chrysogena enjoyed with him children and a life in common. Things got better and better for the couple from year to year because they began each day with sacrifice to her: when mortals cultivate the gods their lives prosper the more. Her offering celebrates her joy and pride in a fulfilled and happy marriage. The past tenses probably mean that Chrysogena has died; within the framework of the poem,²² Amphicles has possibly commissioned the epigram in memory of her and her offering. In that case, he characterizes himself as grateful to his wife and sharing in her sense of pleasure at their happy married life. The way in which a grieving person is characterized while the ostensible aim is to characterize the grieved one is more naturally found in the epitaph category of epigram, to which we may now turn.

Characterization in epitaphs can best be examined under three broad headings. There are the “objective” poems, in which the life of the deceased is sketched by the mourner or the poet acting as his or her persona; the “subjective” poems, in which the deceased speaks in his or her person; and the “reflective” poems, in which the character of the mourner is “reflected” by the words of the objective or subjective speaker. Overlap of the three main types introduces a number of additional grades.²³

The objective epitaph is perhaps the most common. A good example of it is Leonidas’ poem on Platthis (72 GP = AP 7.726). The mourner or the poet describes how the old woman Platthis “often pushed away sleep” in the evening or at dawn in her attempt to ward off poverty,

²¹ See also Anon. 38 GP.

²² Rossi (2001: 239–46) convincingly interprets the poem as being dedicatory in frame only, while its real purpose is to make the reader approve of the Ptolemies’ encouragement of the cult of Aphrodite.

²³ Cf. Díaz de Cerio (1999), who traces the development, from inscriptional to literary funerary epigram, of discursive modes, whether they are narrative, or direct, or addresses to the passerby, or exchanges between the deceased or the tomb and the passerby, or dialogues.

and sang to her distaff and spindle till old age, moving back and forth before the loom till dawn as if in the long running-race of Athene and the Graces, or, despite her wrinkles, smoothing the yarn on her wrinkled knee in sufficient quantity for the job at hand, only to see the River Acheron as an eighty-year-old.²⁴ The type includes characterizing poems like the group on bibulous old women,²⁵ or pieces on stereotypes like Hipponax, “waspy” even from the grave.²⁶

The subjective type is well illustrated by certain poems in the *τρόποι* section of the New Posidippus, Obbink’s analysis of which we have already met. In fact, the first poem in the series is a good example. The deceased, Menoetius the Cretan, complains about the way the bystander is disturbing his sleep by his inquiries after the dead man’s identity and origins; he curtly commands the visitor to move on, and then gives his name and patronymic, asserting his laconicity, which is “as to be expected [of me] in a foreign land.” Menoetius’ gruff manner is conveyed, as well as his distrust of communicating too much with people when he is away from his native land. Callimachus’ variant on the theme (35 GP = AP 7.447 = 11 Pf.) is a masterpiece of subtlety:²⁷

Σύντομος ἦν ὁ ξεῖνος, ὃ καὶ στίχος οὐ μακρὰ λέξων
Θῆρις Ἀρισταίου Κρής ἐπ’ ἐμοὶ δολιχός.

The foreigner was concise, which is why the line intending to say briefly

“Theris, son of Aristaeus, Cretan” on me is a marathon.

The grave seems to be the speaker here (n.b. “on me”), so the grave is characterized as wishing to reflect its occupant’s character and tastes as well, sharing in his typically Cretan preference for brevity of expression and distaste for long-windedness.²⁸ And yet the inscription and

²⁴ Cf. Leonidas’ epitaphic elegy on Aristocrates, 11 GP, and its apparent companion piece, 10 GP, in which, however, the objective and subjective modes are combined.

²⁵ Dioscorides 29 GP, Leonidas 68 GP, Antipater of Sidon 27 GP, Ariston 2 GP, Argentarius 2 GP *Garland*, Antipater of Thessalonica PG *Garland* 101, Anon. 51 *FGE*.

²⁶ Alcaeus 13 GP, Leonidas 58 GP, Theocritus 13 GP, Philip 34 GP *Garland*; and see Rosen in this volume.

²⁷ Various interpreted: Gow-Page (1965: 2.192).

²⁸ Jon Bruss suggests to me that Callimachus may be making direct use of the Theophrastan type of the stingy man (Μικρολογία, *Characters* 10) by an allusive reflection of the term μικρολογία in the phrasing οὐ μακρὰ λέξων (literally, “intending to say not long things”) at the end of the first line. If that were the case, the stereotypicality of the Cretan is given an added dimension.

the development of the couplet also betray the Cretan's direct (and therefore "subjective") involvement in the creation of the epitaph.²⁹ The subjective approach is also illustrated by the poems on Diogenes, as when he haggles over the fare across the Acheron (Leonidas 59 GP = *AP* 7.67), or by the series on misanthropes like Timon of Athens who crave peace in the grave.³⁰ This is another way in which Hellenistic epigram can individualize stock characters and themes.

The "reflective" epigrams can be based on objective accounts of the life of the deceased, and then reflect the kindness, piety and so forth of the people who have buried him or her. A striking instance of this type is Leonidas' piece on Theris the fisherman (20 GP = *AP* 7.295). The old man's winning of a livelihood from working the lobster pots, his diving like a seagull, and his fishing activities are all detailed; his boat was small, but he wasn't the victim of bad weather or winds; he simply died in his rush cottage, "snuffed out like a lantern naturally after his long lifetime;" nor did he have a wife or family to erect his grave, only a guild of fellow fishermen. Theris' life is characterized graphically and movingly, but the brief concluding mention of the fact that his colleagues gave him burial is a discreet acknowledgement of their kindness. The logic of the poem, whether fictitious or not, requires that it was Theris' friends who commissioned the epigram, and the humility of the reference to their own part in Theris' obsequies in fact adds significantly to the characterization of their humanity.³¹

Other poems use the subjective mode as a basis for reflecting the character of the people who gave the deceased decent burial. An interesting case in point is Callimachus' poem on a shipwrecked foreigner who was buried by Leontichus (50 GP = *AP* 7.277 = 58 Pf.). In answer to the visitor's question "Who are you, shipwrecked stranger?" the deceased replies that Leontichus found his corpse on the shore and heaped up this mound over it, "shedding tears over his own precarious life, for he doesn't ply the sea peacefully either, but like a seagull." The deceased thus tells all that could be known of the life of an anonymous corpse, and then turns to reflect Leontichus' personal motive for wanting to give

²⁹ Another relevant experiment with the theme is Leonidas 17 GP.

³⁰ Callimachus 52 GP, Hegesippus 8 GP and Zenodotus 3 GP are good examples of the type; cf. Leonidas 74 GP, on the poor unfortunate whose grave has been disturbed by roadworks, and 100 GP.

³¹ On this poem as a subversion of the topos of death at sea note Gutzwiller (1998b: 95–6, 102).

the corpse its last rights: it is the sense of the frailty of life shared by the dead man and Leontichus. When we realise that Leontichus must have been the commissioner of the piece, we appreciate that in fact it is he who is expressing his feelings. The result is a changing set of perspectives on the characters and situations of the buried and the burier.³² A more obvious example is Posidippus 48 AB in which the slave-woman Bithynis is made to state that her grave beside her excellent masters is worth more than her freedom. True, Bithynis is characterized for her loyal sentiments as a slave, but the reflected nobility of the masters who must have commissioned the poem is the dominant feature.³³

Hellenistic epigram also shows a fascination with the way character can be expressed by sculpture and painting. Two poems on Lysippus' bronze statue of Alexander the Great, Asclepiades 43 GP (= *APL* 120) and Posidippus 65 AB (= *APL* 119 = 18 GP), illustrate this interest nicely for the epigrams on political figures. Asclepiades describes the king's daring directly, and compliments Lysippus on capturing his whole physical presence in the statue; then he claims that the statue's gaze to heaven makes it resemble a person about to say, "I place the earth under my power, Zeus, but you take Olympus." Alexander's characteristic daring finds dramatic expression in the words that his statue seems on the point of saying. Posidippus, on the other hand, praises the sculptor for his daring and skill in tackling the subject, because his Alexander has the glance of fire; because of the fierceness that the statue conveys in this way, "The Persians aren't to be blamed: cattle can be forgiven for fleeing a lion." Alexander's fiery gaze is seized upon, and then the onlooker illustrates it by a reaction of his own. Certain portraits of poets evoke similar admiration, as happens in Posidippus 63 AB on Hecataeus' bronze statue of Philitas of Cos. The epigram contains much praise of the statue's close resemblance to Philitas in all respects. Moreover,

³² See further Bing (1995b: 124–6), and see, in this volume, the treatment of the poem by Meyer.

³³ A similar strategy is employed by Anon. 25 *FGE*, on Manes the Persian slave. It is interesting that in neither poem is the owner's name disclosed. The poems on servants can display a complex interplay between inscriptional precedents and typifying language, "subjective" and "objective" elements. An example is Theocritus 11 GP, Medeius' grateful epitaph for his wet-nurse Clita, which can be compared with e.g. *CEG* 571 (Athens, directly after 350 B.C.); see Rossi (2001: 305–22, esp. 309). The effect of borrowing such "typical" modes of language and sentiment from actual epigram is to invest "reality" on the literary epigram and its proposed occasion. For a similar procedure see below, n. 36. The poems on stranded dolphins (e.g. Antipater of Thessalonica 17 GP *Garland*) also reflect the character of their buriers.

Hecataeus did not endow Philitas with heroic proportions, but kept his representation firmly within human bounds, skilfully rendering the “old perfectionist” (ἄκρομέριμνον...πρέσβυν, 5–6). Indeed, the statue “looks like someone about to speak, such is the character (ἦθος) with which it is embellished” (7). Philitas’ “perfectionism” must be a vital ingredient of that character. As for the heroic dimensions, they are reserved for the commissioner of the statue, Ptolemy Philadelphus, “god as well as king” (9), who despite his elevated status has granted the Coan poet a statue because of his poetry (10). We might be pardoned for thinking that the epigram commemorates Philitas’ character as much as the statue did.³⁴

Epigram also praises the evocation of character in certain representations of mythological themes. The figure who most caught our poets’ eyes was Medea, whose dual and contradictory feelings of anger and pity the painter Timomachus is particularly felt to have conveyed. The most interesting of the series on this subject is Antiphrilos 48 GP *Garland* (= *AP* 136). Timomachus is complimented on essaying the theme of Medea “dragged this way and that by jealousy and her children” (2), in doing which he took on the enormous task of “portraying her double character” (ἵνα ἦθεα δισσὰ χαράξῃ, 3). The onlooker is included in the epigram by the direct address, “Look at the image” (5), since a tear lives in her threats, and anger in her compassion (6). The speaker invites the onlooker to take the intention, thus characterized, for the deed of Medea’s murder of her children: the bloodshed of her children was appropriate for Medea, but not for the hand of Timomachus (7–8). In this way the painter’s characterization of Medea’s complexity is admired, but so too is Timomachus’ skill and his restraint in not depicting the horrendous deed itself.³⁵

On the other hand, epigrams can celebrate art’s achievement in capturing the character of ordinary contemporary human beings. An instance of this is found in Nossis 9 GP (= *AP* 6.354). Nossis says that Sabaethis’ beauty and dignity are easily recognizable in the statue

³⁴ The well-known and well-discussed poems on Anacreon by Theocritus 15 GP and Leonidas 31 GP are further examples of epigrams which focus on the character of poets as it is brought out in representational art.

³⁵ Other poems on the theme include Antipater of Thessalonica 29 GP *Garland*, Philip 71 GP *Garland*, Anon. 86 *FGE*, Leonidas of Alexandria 23 *FGE*, and Gaetulicus 7 *FGE*. Contrast the comic and bawdy pieces on countryside representations of Hermes and Heracles in Leonidas 27 GP, and Priapus in Antistius 4 GP *Garland*, Argentarius 37 GP *Garland*, and Philip 75 GP *Garland*.

even from a distance, and the poetess says she can imagine that she is looking at the prudent woman and her graciousness. The statue's characterization of its subject through visual means is itself a matter of interest.³⁶ Even the characterization of animals in art is a theme, a representative epigram being Posidippus 72 AB, where the statue of a colt who won at the Nemean Games by a nose is said to have expressed the horse's tenacity by the way its whole body seems to be drawing in air, its flanks stretched to the limit. Again, the visual cue brings out the inner nature.³⁷

The amatory epigrams represent the branch of Hellenistic epigram which is by far the most concerned with characterization, and it is with these poems that we may most appropriately conclude our survey.³⁸ If characterization involves bringing out the ἦθος, διάνοια, character, personality or character-trait of a person, poets in amatory epigram bring out the special effects which the emotion of love has on mood or behavior. These may include familiar emotions like depression, elation, energization, enslavement, jealousy, bitterness, or joy. The poets of amatory epigram also typically give expression to the way the speakers in the poems deal with those effects, whether pragmatically, with resignation, inevitably doomed defiance or the like. And the means by which the kaleidoscope of emotions is conveyed can range from purely objective to subjective, with any number of gradations in between.

Asclepiades 3 GP (= AP 5.153) on the effect of Cleophon's glances on Nicarete is a beautiful example of the objective mode, though subjective elements create a subtle overlay:

Νικαρέτης τὸ πόθοισι βεβαμμένον ἡδὺ πρόσωπον
 πυκνὰ δι' ὑψηλῶν φαίνομενον θυρίδων
 αἰ χαροπαὶ Κλεοφῶντος ἐπὶ προθύροισι μάραναι
 Κύπρι φίλῃ, γλυκεροῦ βλέμματος ἀστεροπαί.

Nicarete's lovely face, bathed in yearning
 as it often appeared at her window above,

³⁶ This poem is also interesting in view of its type-characterization. Though Sabae this is highly typified when compared with the "typifying" language of the inscribed epigrams of roughly the same period (see e.g. *CEG* 551, ca. 350 B.C., with the index s.v. ἀρετή), the net result of using such language is to make her a "real" person, since the typical terminology is borrowed from real epigram. Again we see Hellenistic epigram balancing typical and individual characterization in a novel way.

³⁷ A similar strategy is used of both the Indian hound Tauron and his opponent in two anonymous epigrams; see Page (1941: 460–3, no. 109).

³⁸ See Gutzwiller in this volume.

was consumed, dear Cypris, by the bright flashes
of Cleophon's sweet glance at the door.

The speaker catches a brief moment of contact between the two lovers chiefly by his selection of the significant visual details of Nicarete's frequent appearances at the window, which betray her captivation, and of Cleophon's position at either his or her door, from which he glances at her. The evaluative adjectives "sweet" to describe her face and "bright" and "sweet" to describe his glances, may be part of the speaker's personal appreciation of the charm of the couple, in which case the subjective element characterizes his own delight at the scene. On the other hand, and the ambiguities actively enrich the mood, the adjectives may be the lovers' focalized responses to one another's beauty, in which case it is they who are characterized. The one definitely personal reaction of the speaker is the expostulation to Aphrodite, but that is deft and effective enough to present his awe at the exquisite sight. That all this is conveyed in one sentence and, in the Greek, in the active voice is a wonderful feat of compression.

The speaker in Callimachus 13 GP (= AP 12.134 = 43 Pf.) seems to be describing a fellow symposiast's lovelorn behaviour objectively in the first four lines. He asks another guest at the symposium whether he has not seen the tell-tale signs: their friend's deep sighs, his love-toasts and the roses in his garland which fall to the ground are all visible signs of an inward emotional state. But suddenly, in the last line, the speaker shows that his guess is shaped by his own experience, and he turns the focus on to himself—"As a thief I know the traces of a thief" (6), a variation on the saying, "It takes a thief to know a thief." In this way, the speaker's character is foregrounded much more prominently than in Callimachus' model, Asclepiades 18 GP (= AP 12.135), in which the speaker maintains his objectivity in describing Nicagoras' unmistakable plight.³⁹ But in a piece like Asclepiades 12 GP (= AP 5.145) the illusion of total subjectivity is presented as the speaker talks to the garlands he is hanging on his beloved's door. Here the speaker is characterized as totally absorbed in his own melancholy: the garlands are told not to shed their leaves too quickly, because the speaker has liberally sprinkled them with his tears—"for the eyes of lovers are always drenched as

³⁹ On this foregrounding see now Bing (2007). For the Hellenistic phenomenon of characterization by means of self-representation, as illustrated by Callimachus' poem, see Walsh (1990).

if with rain" (3)—but to wait till they see the beloved opening the doors, when they are to "sprinkle my tearful shower over his head so that his golden hair might better drink my tears." The self-pity in the proverbial-sounding phrase is very different in tone from what we find in Callimachus' proverb about the thief.⁴⁰ Or take Meleager 41 GP (= AP 5.24), in which the speaker in fact observes himself in a struggle between his soul and his weakness: "My soul warns me to flee my yearning for Heliodora since it knows all my tears and earlier jealousy; that's what it says, but I don't have the strength to resist, because my cruel soul itself both warns and loves while it warns."⁴¹ The speaker here assesses his character with perfect objectivity, and yet acknowledges his total subjectivity and lack of control over falling in love.

Dioscorides 5 GP (= AP 5.55 = 7 Galán Vioque) recreates an erotic experience in quite a different way. The speaker pictures Doris on the bed, astride his middle with her rosy buttocks and long legs, with languorous eyes, and with her breasts (?) shaking as she gesticulates until she reaches orgasm, whereupon she collapses in relief and relaxation. Her sensations are indicated mainly by visual detail. The speaker comments on his own ecstasy directly: he "became immortal in her blossoming charms," he says, referring to their orgasm as a discharge of "white power." But he is the one in a position to see Doris' pleasure. While her gaze is turned inwards in her total involvement, he is all eyes, observing closely. He can even comment on her performance as if it were an athletic event, for he remarks, approvingly, that she "completed the foot-race of Aphrodite without swerving." His direct description and his use of a metaphor show him as being in perfect control of his powers of observation, and thus as strikingly detached, while Doris' gaze is turned inward with pleasure and self-absorption. In this way, he and Doris are presented with contrasting responses to their love-making. The exchange of perspectives is a chief feature of the poem.⁴²

Désinvolture of a different kind can be seen in the poems in which the speaker is presented as entirely capable of assessing his chances with prospective lovers. A good instance of this is Posidippus' piece on

⁴⁰ Cf. Asclepiades' 18.1 GP, "Wine is the test of love," which rather demonstrates the speaker's distance.

⁴¹ Sider (1997: 110–2) gives this poem to Philodemus, and relates it to Epicurean psychology.

⁴² At Zanker (1987: 163) I called the poem "purely comic" in terms of literary genres; Fowler (1989: 146–7) and Galán Vioque (2001: 157–70, esp. 159–60) draw attention to other effects.

Pythias (130 AB = *AP* 5.213 = 4 GP). The speaker cheerfully claims that he will be off if Pythias is sleeping with somebody else, but if she is not she should let him stay: proof of his ardor is the fact that he has followed his passion here, drunk and through the midst of thieves. He reveals his realistic assessment of the situation and his best tactics in the circumstances. Similarly, we have the remarkable miniature mimes in which the speaker propositions a girl, her nurse or her go-between in the street. One of these is by Antiphrilos (14 GP *Garland* = *AP* 5.308), who introduces a speaker addressing the girl in a monologue. He asks her name, offering to pay her price, but gets annoyed at her silence. He asks whether she has a lover, but bids her farewell when she continues to be unresponsive, and promises to give her another try later, since he has successfully tackled harder girls in the past.⁴³ The speaker is characterized deftly and in a number of ways. Despite the girl's silence, for example, he sizes her up with a string of adjectives: "charmer" (κομψή), "your pretty name" (καλὸν οὖνομα), "haughty" (σοβαρή), and "harder girls than you" (σοῦ σκληροτέρας). He peppers her with questions, and uses the striking phrase καὶ πάλι καὶ πάλι ("again and again"), so showing his persistence. He certainly is self-confident, and has a cheerful ability to break off his advances when things aren't shaping up as he'd have wanted—"for now" (νῦν δ')! These poems contrast with the forlorn and bitter disillusionment of the pieces on a lover's venality.⁴⁴ Here again the tonal range is astonishingly broad.

Hellenistic epigram therefore does illustrate a lively interest in characterization and how to achieve it in the brief space the epigram-form allowed. If we compare Hellenistic with earlier epigram, we immediately note that the degree of characterization found in the Hellenistic poems is unprecedented and even unthinkable in the earlier period. On the other hand, with a few honorable exceptions,⁴⁵ characterization is not nearly so prominent in epigram written after the high Hellenistic period, when the emphasis is so heavily on convention and variation, especially in terms of verbal point. Where nearly all the poets of

⁴³ See also Diotimus 1 GP *Garland*, Philodemus 4 GP *Garland*, and Anon. 6 *FGE*.

⁴⁴ E.g., Maccius 3 GP *Garland*.

⁴⁵ See especially Antipater of Thessalonica 7, 17, 21, 23, 53, 101 GP *Garland*; Automedon 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 11 GP *Garland*; Maccius 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 11 GP *Garland*; and Philodemus 1, 3, 4, 8, 12, 13, 17, 21 GP *Garland*.

Meleager's *Garland* show an active fascination with expressing character (though the charms of Meleager himself on the whole lie elsewhere), few poets from the *Garland* of Philip share their predecessors' interest. This is in itself a useful index of the direction in which epigram was to develop.

EPIGRAMS ON ART VOICE AND VOICELESSNESS IN ECPHRASTIC EPIGRAM

Irmgard Männlein-Robert

Hellenistic epigrams on works of art are for the most part transmitted in Book 9 of *AP*, in the *APL*, as well as in the Milan Posidippus Papyrus (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309). Though it is often hard to distinguish ecphrastic epigrams on the basis of their content from the thematically more general and essentially more capacious subgenre of “epideictic” epigrams of a rhetorical stamp,¹ they do exhibit distinctive traits. Above all they attempt to imitate inscriptional epigrams and are incomplete in their descriptions. Their frequently unsatisfactory differentiation from epideictic epigrams is connected with their transmission: in Book 9 of the *AP*, for example, a group of largely uniformly ecphrastic epigrams from poem 584 until the end of the book follows on the heels of an epideictic grouping interspersed with epigrams on works of art (1–583). It is on this basis that we can discern the underlying anthology of Cephala as the source of the separation of these two types of epigram.²

What is an Ecphrastic Epigram? Characteristics and Tendencies

In the Hellenistic epigrams that deal with works of art, we normally do not find any detailed, complete description of the work’s form or even of its artistic details.³ In other words, ecphrastic epigram does not deal primarily with a differentiated and coherent description in the sense of a full epideixis or rhetorical *descriptio* as formulated in imperial and late antique school texts for all manner of possible subjects.⁴ In this essay,

¹ On this, see esp. Lauxterman (1998).

² On the research, see Lauxterman (1998: 526–9); Waltz, Aubreton, and Buffière (1957: 7.xxxi–xxxvii); and Rossi (2001: 15–6).

³ E.g., Leonidas of Tarentum 31 and 90 GP (= *APL* 306–7), on which, see below; for an exception, see Rossi (2001: 16).

⁴ Aelius Theon *Progymn.* 118.7–120.11 (Spengel 2); Aphthonius *Progymn.* 46.15–49.2 (Spengel 2); Hermogenes *Progymn.* 16.11–17.8 (Spengel 2); Libanius *Progymn.* 853–4 (Reiske 4). The phrase, ἑκφρασις ἀγαλμάτων, ecphrasis on works of art, appears first in

“ecphrasis”—or rather the anachronistic modern expression “ecphrastic epigram”—follows present-day scholarly fashion in designating epigrams that take as their subject works of art, such as paintings, portraits, gems, and statues which yet, as is often the case, fail to describe them in a detailed, objective, and analytical fashion (for which epigram with its few lines affords very little room).⁵ So the concern here is not poetic imitations of art imbued with a stirring *enargeia* (clarity), but rather the poetic identification of a work of art and the poetic *mise en scene* of an important interpretative pronouncement on it.⁶ When the name of the artist is even mentioned (on which, below), it is only when the epigram has to do with famous pre-Hellenistic artists like Myron, Praxiteles, and Lysippus whose works were well known.⁷ Pointed allusions to one of their famous works appeal to the corresponding background knowledge of the recipient. Thus, while scholarship on “ecphrastic epigram” has from time to time been more interested in actual descriptions (*ecphrasis/descriptio*) for their art-historical usefulness,⁸ it nevertheless always deals with a piece of poetry that reflects a work of art and its specific function.

In Hellenistic epigram, it is the act of observing the work of art that is thrust to the fore. Most often, this act is expressed through a dramatic *mise en scene*, even in dialogue form, and in expressly mimetic fashion. Besides matters of perception, such poems also touch on how the work of art ought to be judged and evaluated. Recent scholarship has situated these poems within the framework of a “culture of viewing.”⁹ Yet it is often impossible to place an epigram within the “genre” of ecphrasis. Indeed, many Hellenistic epigrams seem to play on their generic ambiguity.¹⁰ Literary epigram, moreover, often imitates inscriptional

Nicolaus (fourth-fifth century) *Progymn.* 67.16–71.5 Felten (= Spengel 3.492.10–23). On ecphrasis see, e.g., Friedländer (1912), Graf (1995), Fantuzzi (1997), Webb (1999).

⁵ For ecphrasis thus characterized, see Lauxtermann (1998: 525–37); Goldhill (1994); Gutzwiller (2004b: 340, n. 3); and Zanker (2003: 59–62).

⁶ Krieger (1995: 46–7); Fantuzzi (1997: 943).

⁷ Numerous miniatures of famous works of art—for private households, for example—are attested for the imperial period, which should be true also for the Hellenistic period, on which see Gutzwiller (1994: 361; bibliography in n. 47).

⁸ Such as, e.g., Benndorf (1862); Schwarz (1971: 134–40 *et passim*); and Hebert (1989); cp., *contra*, Friedländer (1912: 55).

⁹ Goldhill (1994); Gutzwiller (2004b); Zanker (2004).

¹⁰ See, for example, the two epigrams of Asclepiades that show amatory and funerary features alongside their ecphrastic elements (Sens (2002b: 250–1)). Meleager combines ecphrastic and erotic themes especially frequently, e.g., 110–1 GP (= *AP* 12.56–57), on which see Gutzwiller (2003: *passim*).

conventions¹¹ in which the viewer and the act of observation hold an essential role. These elements are thus integrated into these poems from the outset. In addition to deictic elements taken over from inscriptions (mostly demonstrative pronouns, since they create the fiction of direct sensory perception), requests that the passerby “look” are also stereotypical. But in literary epigram what had been the viewer of a monument is transformed into the reader of a scroll.¹² It is thus left to the reader to imagine the work of art since the new writtenness of poetry severs the previously close connection between art and text characteristic of inscribed epigram, whether funerary or dedicatory.¹³ The reader must reconstruct for himself in his here and now the often layered context of the artwork. New, too, are the emphatic directions given by epigram’s speaker who steps forward in the role of an authoritative exegete and directs the gaze of the addressee.¹⁴ The actual subject of an ecphrastic epigram is therefore often the interpretation of an artwork. Ecphrastic tendencies and elements are found with especial frequency in dedicatory and funerary epigrams and not least in puzzle epigrams. In this last subgenre, ecphrasis needs to be taken in its original sense as description—as explanation and interpretation—here, of symbols.¹⁵

Another innovation in Hellenistic ecphrastic epigram is that poets use works of art to speak not only about artistic values, but also their own poetological principles. These epigrams belong therefore not only to a Hellenistic “culture of viewing” together with its philosophical and cultural background;¹⁶ they also say something about poetological conditions and literary epigram’s potential. Theoretical considerations underlying the production of art, especially of painting, sculpting, and engraving become analogous to poetic creation. The premise for this is, of course, the old analogy between the “sister arts” which here comes to the fore due to those arts’ shared interest in realism when presenting

¹¹ Sens (2002b: 250–1).

¹² References at Rossi (2001: 17, n. 13).

¹³ On the writtenness of poetry, see Blum (1977), Pfeiffer (1978), Bing (1988b) and (1995); on the severing of art from text, Rossi (2001: 17–21).

¹⁴ On “showing” in ecphrastic contexts, Boehm (1995: 38–40) and Rossi (2001: 17, n. 13).

¹⁵ Note the comparable ecphrases on letters (as symbols); see, e.g., Heraclitus 1 GP (= *AP* 7.465), Alcaeus of Messene 16 GP (= *AP* 7.429) (on which, see Bruss (2002–3) and, more extensive, Männlein-Robert (forthcoming 2006/7: ch. 5.3).

¹⁶ Goldhill (1994: 197–223) as well as Gutzwiller (2002a), Zanker (2003: 72–102) and Sens (2005a: 209–16).

their subjects.¹⁷ Epigrammatists praise artists (especially older ones such as Myron and Lysippus) and their works in whom they find contemporary Hellenistic benchmarks for quality; thus mentioning the artist's skilful "hand" and his laborious work becomes *de rigueur*. Sculpture, for instance, appears analogous to epigram, exhibiting the same principles of composition and reception.¹⁸ Poets playfully highlight how this art-form creates illusion, even as they subtly puncture it¹⁹ (through, e.g., the naming of the artist, his material, and pointing out shortcomings of the work of art)—all this with characteristic self-referentiality. The strikingly frequent absence of the name of the artist whose creation the epigram celebrates is symptomatic.²⁰ If our eye is directed toward the abilities of the artist even as he remains anonymous,²¹ then either we are dealing with poems on famous works of the masters who had long become the object of poetic *imitatio* and *aemulatio*,²² or else with an implicit reference by the artist to his own art. Not least, even terms having to do with writing media, such as *pinax* (see below), which appear in the specific context to be related to the work of art, often prove upon further investigation to be signals demanding the epigram to be read from a poetological perspective.

Yet, it is not just that poetic principles are embodied in an analogous work of art; rather, from the Hellenistic era on, epigram more frequently disrupts the traditional analogy drawn between the sister arts and emphasizes their differences.²³ Indications of the repositioning of poetry's relationship toward plastic art and its ramped-up self-styling

¹⁷ Hagstrum (1958: 3–128); Sprigath (2004).

¹⁸ Zanker (2003).

¹⁹ On the implicit destruction of the illusion, see Becker (1992).

²⁰ Above all in epigrams that take up statues of poets, for example Theocritus *AP* 9.599 (= 15 GP), 9.600 (= 17 GP), 13.3 (= 13 GP), and 7.664 (= 14 GP); so also Leonidas of Tarentum, *AP* 306 (= 31 GP) and *AP* 307 (= 90 GP); see also Männlein-Robert (2004).

²¹ See, for example, Erinna *AP* 6.352 (= 3 GP); Antimachus *AP* 9.321.1–3; Anonymous *AP* 97 and 127; Satyrus *AP* 195; Alcaeus of Messene *AP* 196 (= 19 GP); Antipater of Thessalonica *AP* 197 (= 89 GP *Garland*); Anonymous *AP* 142.5, 194, 265.1; cp. also Antipater of Sidon *AP* 9.790 (= 92 GP). The further literature in Häusle (1980: 52, n. 119) and Gow-Page (1965: 2.366) shows that the matter has not really been settled and no consequences drawn.

²² As, for example, Myron's *Cow* (see above).

²³ As has been noted in the most recent scholarship, e.g., Mitchell (1986), Heffernan (1993), Becker (2003), Männlein-Robert (forthcoming 2007). On the prior history and the famous dictum of Simonides on the matter ("painting is silent poetry; and poetry, a speaking picture"), see Sprigath (2004); on Lessing's reactivation of the ancient differentiation between these arts, see Krieger (1995).

as its superior exist from the earliest days of the Hellenistic period. A famous epigram by the mid-to-late-fourth-century²⁴ Boeotian poetess Erinna 3 GP (= *AP* 6.352) may serve as an example. It is putatively the first “ecphrastic” epigram:

Ἐξ ἀταλᾶν χειρῶν τάδε γράμματα· λῶστε Προμαθεῦ,
 ἔντι καὶ ἄνθρωποι τὴν ὁμαλοῖ σοφίαν.
 ταύταν γοῦν ἐτύμως τὰν παρθένον ὅστις ἔγραψεν
 αἰ καὺδὸν ποτέθηκ', ἥς κ' Ἀγαθαρχίς ὅλα.

This picture is the work of delicate hands. Good Prometheus,
 There are men whose skill is equal to yours.

At least if whoever drew this girl so truly

Had added also her voice, you would be the complete Agatharchis.

(trans. after Paton)²⁵

Deictic reference here points to the portrait of a young woman named Agatharchis. The portrait's verisimilitude (ἐτύμως, 3) places the (unnamed) human artist in the ranks of the divine artist, Prometheus. It is notable that the artist's hands are characterized as delicate (ἀταλᾶν, 1). However, the *enallage* here, the transference of the adjective ἀταλᾶν, collapses the girl's delicate hands together with the artist's, the one who paints so true to life.²⁶ Yet the epigrammatist introduces a further, poetological level into her poem: the delicacy of the hands begs to be applied also to the poetess Erinna and her elegant and refined style.²⁷ The artistic skill (σοφία, 2) which, on a superficial level, is ascribed to the painter, is laid claim to by the poetess for herself. The dual sense of the γράμματα points in that direction, as well. The term normally refers to “lines,” that is, something written, i.e., poetry,²⁸ but may also refer to a painting (in the sense of its “lines” or contours).²⁹ Erinna uses this term specifically because of its ambiguity and hints not only

²⁴ On her dating, Scholz (1973); cp. Gutzwiller's earlier dating (1997a: 203–4).

²⁵ (1916–9: 1.485–7).

²⁶ Gutzwiller (2002a: 88). See also Murray and Rowland in this volume, 223–5.

²⁷ Cp. the Apelles anecdote (Pliny, *nat. hist.* 35.81) wherein Apelles, visiting the studio of his colleague Protogenes and not finding him there, drew a colored line of highest refinement on a tablet. When Protogenes returned, he was able to deduce the work as Apelles' specifically because of the line's finesse (*subtilitas*).

²⁸ See, for example, Erinna 1.6–8 GP (= *AP* 7.710.6–8), Asclepiades 4 GP (= *AP* 5.158) and 32.3–4 GP (= *AP* 9.63.3–4); in addition, Callimachus fr. 398 Pf. and 53 GP (= *AP* 7.471), Leonidas of Tarentum 101.1–2 GP (= *AP* 9.25.1–2), Herondas 4.24.73, Theocritus 23 GP (= *AP* 7.262), Callimachus fr. 64.7–8 Pf. Further attestations in Rossi (2001: 335, n. 2).

²⁹ For example, at Euripides *Ion* 1146.

at the painting, but also at her own poem, a device found elsewhere in Hellenistic poetry.³⁰

There is of course yet another indication that Erinna's compliment to the artist is merely a pretext. For with the remark in the last verse, "had [he] added also her voice" (an impossibility for the painter), the praise of the apparently perfect illusion breaks down. The very bounds of the painter's art—within which he is undoubtedly in full control—are shown him, for it is not his art, but that of the poetess, *her γράμματα*, that can present the "voice." With this, Erinna definitively shifts in her pronouncements away from the medium of plastic art, painting, into the medium of poetry, voice, and points to its superiority (though, ironically and perhaps in order to underline the painting's deficiency, she refrains from exploiting her medium's potential by allowing Agatharchis' voice to speak. Here for the first time in early Hellenistic poetry we detect a distance between plastic art and poetry, between image and text.³¹

A similar constellation appears in two epigram cycles that belong to the literary book culture of the Hellenistic period: the ecphrastic epigrams by Nossis and Posidippus. The eleven epigrams by Nossis, from Epizephyrian Locri in southern Italy, are mostly ecphrastic. Though now scattered about *GA*, they derive from a reconstructable original poetry book arranged by the poetess herself.³² In her ecphrastic epigrams, Nossis ensconces herself in the scene as a tour guide who points out works of art in a temple that had been set up there as dedications, and in short dramatic scenes she examines the chief elements of their ability to impress the viewer. In the same way as a priest, who traditionally was the one to explain the works of art placed in a sacred precinct, it is now the poetess who, as exegete, offers a tour by means of the collection of her poems, using the sacred space as the backdrop for her own art. The parallels between the characteristics of the women represented in the portraits and Nossis' own poetry are particularly pronounced in the dedication of the self-portrait of a certain Callo (Nossis 6 GP = *AP* 9.605):

Τὸν πίνακα ξανθοῦς Καλλῶ δόμον εἰς Ἀφροδίτας
εἰκόνα γραψαμένα πάντ' ἀνέθηκεν ἴσαν.

³⁰ See e.g. Theocritus 15, 81 and Herondas I 24; IV 73.

³¹ In greater detail on this matter, see Männlein-Robert (forthcoming 2007: ch. 3 and ch. 6); on the criterion of "wholeness," see Bing (1988a).

³² Gutzwiller (1997a: 213–6) and (1998b: 75–7, 85–7); Skinner (1991: 33–5); Luck (1954: 183, 187).

ὥς ἀγανῶς ἔστακεν· ἴδ' ἅ χάρις ἀλίκον ἀνθεῖ.
χαιρέτω, οὐ τίνα γὰρ μέμψιν ἔχει βιοτᾶ.

In the temple of blond Aphrodite did Callo dedicate the tablet,
having drawn a likeness equal [to herself] in all respects.
How sweetly it stands there! Look how her gracefulness blooms.
Let her rejoice, for her lifestyle is blameless.

The viewer of Callo's picture in the temple of Aphrodite stands in awe of its verisimilitude and grace and encourages another to view (ἴδ', 3). The multivalent terms πίναξ ("tablet for writing or drawing") and γραψαμένα ("write or draw") reflect not only a tablet bearing a picture, but the tablet's more familiar function as a medium of writing.³³ The self-portrait of Callo thus stands for Nossis' epigram itself, which in turn represents its composer in true detail and true to life. Appropriately, it represents her not by describing the painting, but through that most basic element of language, a name: for "Callo" signifies the "beauty" to which the portrait is "equal in all respects". The rest—"how sweetly she stands there! Look how her gracefulness blooms"—is just a gloss. The apostrophized viewer in line 3 corresponds with the reader of Nossis' epigrams, who is drawn into the imaginary dedicatory scene. The arrangement of the art works in the temple picks up the disposition of the epigrams in the literary collection of Nossis' ecphrastic epigrams. The reader is transformed into a viewer of art invited to see the work with his own eyes. The poetess presents her readers with her poems just as the exegete in the temple of Aphrodite shows the viewers the works of art.³⁴ Above and beyond mere seeing and viewing of *objets d'art* in the situation as it is depicted, the poem demands to be taken as an allegory for reading and interpreting.

Posidippus follows the same principle. A contemporary of Nossis, his *oeuvre* has been considerably expanded since the 1990s through the discovery of the Milan Posidippus Papyrus (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309).³⁵ With the date for its composition placed easily in the second half of the third century B.C., the epigram collection contains ecphrastic topoi and

³³ Cp. also the *Pinakes* of Callimachus, a bibliographic encyclopedia (on which, see Blum (1977)), as well as the notion of *pinakes* as bearers of (prose) dedicatory inscriptions (on which, Bing (2004: 284–5)). Earlier, cp. Homer *Il.* 6.168–9, 176.178.

³⁴ Casson (1974), Bing (2002) and Jones (2001: 33–9).

³⁵ On the question of authenticity, see the summary of the discussion in Acosta-Hughes, Kosmetatou, and Baumbach (2004: 4–5).

elements in the sections *Lithika*, *Hippika*, and *Iamatika*,³⁶ and especially in the fifth section made up of epigrams on bronze statues, *Andriantopoiika*. In its programmatic introductory poem (62 AB), the speaker draws the attention of young contemporary sculptors to the works of the artist Lysippus and his students as exemplary models. They should, so the speaker, exceed the older masters such as Polyclitus in lifelike presentation. In the following poems, the speaker appears as an exegete guiding the sculptors he is addressing through an exhibition of works recommended as worthy of imitation. For these “Pictures at an Exhibition,” however, in comparison to Nossis’, the aesthetics and methodology of producing art stand in the foreground. The space envisioned for this viewing of art is significant and new. No longer a temple, as in Nossis, the space is now a profane “gallery” in which the reader imagines his viewing. The second epigram of this section (63 AB)—the first of the *Andriantopoiika* devoted to one particular work of art—establishes parallels with the poetic theory and aesthetics of Posidippus himself: this poem points the imaginary viewer to a particularly realistic bronze of the poet and philologist Philitas of Cos, in many respects considered the founding father of the Hellenistic avantgarde.³⁷ This epigram reveals the multi-level composition of ecphrastic epigram:³⁸

τόνδε Φιλίται χ[αλ]κὸν [ῥ]σον κατὰ πάνθ’ Ἐκ[α]ταῖος
 ἀ]κ[ρ]ιβῆς ἄκρους [ἔ]πλ]ασεν εἰς ὄνυχας,
 καὶ με]γέθει κα[ὶ] σα]ρκὶ τὸν ἀνθρωπιστὶ διώξας
 γνόμο]ν’, ἀφ’ ἡρώων δ’ οὐδὲν ἔμειξ’ ἰδέης,
 ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀκρομέριμον ὄλ[η]ι κ]ατεμάζατο τέχνηι
 πρ]έσβυν, ἀληθείης ὀρθὸν [ἔ]χων κανόνα·
 αὐδῆσ]οντι δ’ ἔοικεν, ὅσῳ ποικίλλεται ἦθει,
 ἔμψυχ]ος, καίπερ χάλκεος ἐὼν ὁ γέρων·
 ἐκ Πτολε]μαίου δ’ ὦδε θεοῦ θ’ ἅμα καὶ βασιλῆος
 ἄγκειτ]αι Μουσέων εἵνεκα Κῶιος ἀνὴρ.

This bronze, similar to Philitas in all aspects, Hecataeus accurately moulded it down to the tip of the toes, following the human [measures] in height and body and without instilling anything from the image of heroes. In fact with all his skill he portrayed the old perfectionist by adhering to the canon of truth.

³⁶ On which see Papalexandrou (2004: 247–58).

³⁷ Spanoudakis (2002: 26–8); Bing (2003).

³⁸ See also Gutzwiller (2002b: 46–8); Kosmetatou (2004c: 196–7); Zanker (2004: 68–9); Bing (2003); Hardie (2003); Bernsdorff (2002) and Sens (2005a: 209–16).

He looks like one on the point of speaking, embellished with such character,

[alive], although the old man is of bronze.

And here, [by order of Ptole]my, god and king at the same time,
the man from Cos [has been set up] for the sake of the Muses.³⁹

The exegete turns the gaze of the viewer above all toward the artistically successful representation of Philitas (5). The naming of the artist Hecataeus, considered a member of the school of Lysippus, and the mention of the statue's material, bronze (1, 8),⁴⁰ underline the illusionary intent in evoking the statue. Rather than describing the work's immediate effect, the poem constitutes a reflection on the fundamental aspects of the statue, its circumstances, and the methods for making this kind of art. The aesthetic premises of plastic art, here easily recognizable (e.g., precision, 2; detail and realistic form, 2–7), converge with Posidippus' own stylistic and poetic program which follows the example of the poet-scholar Philitas of Cos.⁴¹ The description of art thus becomes a poetic tool—it is worth recalling the statement in the fourth distich that the statue seems ready to speak (7–8). As a matter of fact, of course, the statue cannot really speak.⁴² The failure of the monument's voice and its inability to speak, foregrounded here as in Erinna, constitute one of the plastic arts' essential deficits.

An important programmatic aspect of this ecphrastic epigram—the first actual such of the *Andriantopoiika*—lies in its presentation of reciprocity between poetry and bronze sculpture. The sculptor's subject is a poet, the poet's subject is a bronze. Hecataeus' artistic abilities and Philitas' poetic principles converge, while Posidippus relies upon Philitas' poetic principles and consequently demonstrates his own—poetic—imitation of Philitas, an imitation of some importance in contemporary poetics. Just as plastic artists ought to take Lysippus and his style as models for their own creations, so Hellenistic poets take Philitas of Cos as prototype of an innovative new style in epigram and elegy.⁴³ It is worth pointing

³⁹ Translation by Austin in Austin and Bastianini (2002: 87).

⁴⁰ Further references in Rossi (2001: 17–8, n. 14).

⁴¹ On which, see Spanoudakis (2002) and Bing (2003).

⁴² Otherwise the paradox in line 8 cannot be resolved; see Sens (2005a: 215, n. 31); contra, Scodel (2003b), whose suggested emendation ἄγκειμαι, which allows the bronze statue of Philitas to speak the last distich, contradicts contemporary epigrammatic convention of hinting at merely apparent speech by works of art. See, for example, also Erinna 3 GP; Asclepiades (*sive* Archelaus) 43.3 GP (= *API* 120.3); Dioscorides 15.4 GP (= *AP* 6.126.4); Anonymous (*sive* Damagetus) *API* 97.6, *inter alia*.

⁴³ See also Spanoudakis (2002: 26–8).

out that since Philitas (320–270 B.C.) is an older contemporary of Posidippus, the poem's emphasis on the age of Philitas might be taken as evidence that Posidippus attributes to him the same authority with which older, pre-Hellenistic poets were imbued.⁴⁴

Dialogue as Ecphrastic Method

Posidippus' famous epigram on Kairos serves as an especially representative example of an ecphrastic epigram.⁴⁵ In this poem, an inquiring passerby quizzes a statue of Kairos by Lysippus;⁴⁶ and the statue, here represented as passive, answers the viewer's questions.⁴⁷ The conversation unfolds into a (self-)description of the Kairos statue, but only through a series of riddling hints⁴⁸—this, in marked contrast with pre-Hellenistic dialogues between viewer and artwork. Posidippus 19 GP (= 142 AB = *APL* 275):⁴⁹

- Τίς, πόθεν ὁ πλάστης;—Σικυνώνιος.—Οὔνομα δὴ τίς;
 —Λύσιππος.—Σὺ δὲ τίς;—Καιρὸς ὁ πανδαμάτωρ.
 —Τίπτε δ' ἐπ' ἄκρα βέβηκας;—'Αεὶ τροχάω.—Τί δὲ ταρσοῦς
 ποσσὶν ἔχεις διφυεῖς;—'Ιπταμ' ὑπηνέμιος.
 —Χεὶρὶ δὲ δεξιτερῇ τί φέρεις ξυρόν;—'Ανδράσι δεῖγμα
 ὥς ἀκμῆς πάσης ὀξύτερος τελέθω.
 —'Η δὲ κόμη τί κατ' ὄψιν;—'Υπαντιάσαντι λαβέσθαι
 νῆ Δία.—Τάξόπιθεν δ' εἰς τί φαλακρὰ πέλει;
 —Τὸν γὰρ ἄπαξ πτηνοῖσι παραθρέξαντά με ποσσὶν
 οὔτις ἔθ' ἰμείρων δράζεται ἐξόπιθεν.
 —Τοῦνεχ' ὁ τεχνίτης σε διέπλασεν;—Εἵνεκεν ὕμεών,
 ξεῖνε, καὶ ἐν προθύροις θῆκε διδασκαλίην.

⁴⁴ See Scodel (1980: 317); Hunter (2001: 251): since old age connotes wisdom (*sophia*), Hellenistic art always depicts the poets in their majority.

⁴⁵ On its authenticity, see Benndorf (1867: 44).

⁴⁶ On relief and fragmentary copies of this statue, see Moser von Filseck (1988: 151) and von Hesberg (1988: 330, n. 85); for reconstructions of the bronze from literary sources, Moser von Filseck (1988: 151–9). For further texts on the statue of Kairos, see Gow-Page (1965: 2.499–500).

⁴⁷ Rasche (1910); Kassel (1983) and (1991); also Burzachechi (1962).

⁴⁸ Contrast the epigram inscribed on the base of a small boy's statue from the Asclepieion in Cos (end of third century B.C.). While still a dialogue between the viewer and the statue, in contrast with literary epigram, it offers no ecphrastic self-description; text in Beazley and Gow (1929: 120–2).

⁴⁹ As in comedy, for example; see Aristophanes *Peace* 657–95; Plato Comicus fr. 204 *PCG* VII K-A where, of course, the muteness of statues is noted as characteristic.

Who and from where is the sculptor?—From Sicyon.—And his name?
 —Lysippus.—And who are you?—Kairos the all-subduer.
 —Why do you stand on tip-toe?—I am always running.—Why do you have
 a pair of wings on your feet?—I fly with the wind.
 —Why do you hold a razor in your right hand?—As a sign to men
 that I am sharper than any edge.
 —And why is there hair over your face?—For the one who meets me
 to grasp at,
 by Zeus.—And why is the back of your head bald?
 —Because none whom I have once raced by on my winged feet
 will now, though he wishes it, take hold of me from behind.
 —Why did the artist fashion you?—For your sake,
 stranger, and he set me up in the portico as a lesson.⁵⁰

The bronze Kairos, the personification of the propitious, but fleeting, moment,⁵¹ is here presented in a medium contrary to his own proper essence—as a stiff, motionless statue. While this statue may at first be puzzling, its significance emerges in the course of the epigrammatic dialogue. The figure of Kairos presents an abstract idea—the propitious moment—together with its proper characteristics, *in concreto*. The details taken as whole do have a specific meaning, and the epigram explains them. Through its striking attributes, the statue makes an oblique reference to something beyond its mere appearance; it is an allegory, to be interpreted.⁵² By dramatizing the process by which the allegory's message becomes manifest, the epigram also demonstrates how such allegorizing ought to be carried out and how one should react “correctly” to such a strange picture. It is worth pointing out that, although the epigram offers a paradigm for allegorical interpretation, there was no *standard* allegorizing iconography such as we find in medieval and renaissance religious art. Allegorizing ecphrases as a group do not constitute an iconographic handbook. Rather each individual explanation is *ad hoc* and indispensable, for even an experienced interpreter would not understand the image without the epigram's help. That said, the first impulse must always come from the inquiring viewer, who here opens the dialogue. His questions arise from an obvious irritation, from being unable to figure out on the basis of standard real-world criteria

⁵⁰ Translation after Austin and Bastianini (2002: 181).

⁵¹ Kerkhoff (1973: 256–274); Pfister (1938: 136–9); Moreno (1990: 920–6).

⁵² For interpretation in such epigrams, see Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 228–38) The line of development that Hinks (1939: 119) proposes for allegory as *continua metaphora* first appears in dialogical epigram.

what the statue represents. At first appearance, the epigram's leading questions—those about the artist, his provenance and name—seem to reflect some sort of artist's signature on the statue itself or its base. After all, it is just that kind of information that the passerby can actually read and understand. And yet, the subsequent allegorizing of Kairos goes far beyond a mere artist's signature. The goal of the plastic artist, like that of the epigrammatist, lies in the instruction (*didaskalia*) of men (cp. δειγμα, 5). This instruction makes particular sense when taken as preparatory, or propaedeutic—as the statue's location in the portico, the entryway (ἐν προθύροις, 12) implies,⁵³ that is, “before the actual task.”⁵⁴ For it may lead readers to enter the edifice of the rhetorical tradition or of contemporary philosophical teaching (especially of the Stoics) so as to explore the doctrine of *kairos* more fully.⁵⁵ Here, the poet Posidippus figures Kairos in an unconventional and paradoxical way—as a phenomenon of time which is always fleeting, yet embodied as a spatially fixed and motionless bronze. Clearly, one cannot grasp the characteristics of *Kairos* even in so artful a bronze statue as this one; rather one needs the dialogical epigram's interpretive help.⁵⁶

Another ecphrastic epigram—a rare instance of an inscribed text transmitted with its image and in its original context—presents an especially notable explanation of unclear elements. This is the Menophila relief from Sardis, dated between the second century B.C. and the first A.D. The structure of the epigram is analogous to that of purely literary *griphos*-epigrams, by which it was certainly inspired.⁵⁷ Ecphrastic in the truest sense of the word, the poem explains in the words of an imagined dialogue the details and signs carved on the grave relief of Menophila. Through its own allegorizing, the poem explains the initially disparate elements as symbols of an intellectual concept and in connection with Menophila's virtues (the basket that appears in the relief, for example, is a sign of her well-disciplined virtue). The epigrammatic text thus shines light on and interprets a work of art otherwise not understand-

⁵³ On the archeological consequences for the poem's placement of the statue, see Moser von Filseck (1988: 275–7).

⁵⁴ See Aristotle, *EN* 110a8.

⁵⁵ Current in rhetoric since the time of Gorgias, on whom see Dionysius of Halicarnassus *De comp. verb.* 12; Kinneavy-Eskin (1998: 836–44, esp. 841); and see Robert (1992: 427–8) on *kairos* as a rhetorical and artistic category.

⁵⁶ So also Gutzwiller (2002a: 95–6).

⁵⁷ Text: *GVI* 1881; more recent bibliography in von Hesberg (1988: 312–6), Gutzwiller (1998b: 265–7), Hunter and Fantuzzi (2004: 336–8).

able on its own, though without recourse to any sort of standardized interpretation of allegories.

Sequences of Ecphrastic Epigrams

One special feature of Hellenistic ecphrastic epigrams is their appearance in series: there are numerous epigram sequences devoted to the same artwork or the same subject of artistic interest. These result, first of all, from the fact that Hellenistic epigrammatists were grappling with the question of the relationship between poetry and plastic art, not to speak of their penchant for variations on a theme in accord with the rhetorical principles of *variatio* and *aemulatio*. It must be admitted, however, that some of the epigram sequences we have also arose through late antique and Byzantine editors of epigram collections who aimed at a certain grouping and arrangement.⁵⁸ In the extant sequences of *AP* (which often arranges such epigrams by the same author side by side),⁵⁹ a peculiar dynamic informs the poems' referential interactions.

Epigrams on mostly pre-Hellenistic poets are especially popular.⁶⁰ We shall focus especially on two by the contemporary poets Leonidas of Tarentum and Theocritus on a bronze statue of the poet Anacreon. The poems employ quite differing structures and have differing aims. In both, the sculptor remains unnamed; nor is he their theme. Leonidas 31 GP (= *AP* 306) takes up the statue of Anacreon in great detail,⁶¹ directing the viewer's gaze (θάέο, 2) to the pose of the drunken old poet, his eyes, clothing, shoes, age, mouth, open as if ready to sing, and instrument, the lyre—in short, it is a factually descriptive, “ecphrastic” poem in the narrow sense. Anacreon's characteristics here do not, of course, really correspond to his biographical reality; rather, they are topical elements distilled from his sympotic and erotic verse.⁶² On

⁵⁸ On which see Cameron (1993), Gutzwiller (1998b), and Lauxtermann (1998).

⁵⁹ Especially those of Antipater of Sidon and Meleager, on which see Gutzwiller (1998b: 227–322).

⁶⁰ Gabathuler (1937); and see Rosen and Barbantani and Acosta-Hughes in this volume.

⁶¹ Compare Leonidas of Tarentum 90 GP (= *AP* 307) in iambs; Antipater of Sidon with five epigrams on Anacreon: *AP* 7.23, 26, 27, 29, and 30 (GP 13–17); and Antipater of Thessalonica 85 GP *Garland* (= *AP* 9.792). See Goldhill (1994: 206–7) and Gabathuler (1937: 71, 98).

⁶² See Rossi (2001: 282–3).

the whole, the poem constitutes a poetic reflection of Anacreon's sculptural representation. On the other hand, an epigram ascribed to Theocritus, 15 GP (= AP 9.599)⁶³ presents itself as an inscription on the base of that statue. In typical inscriptional-ecphrastic manner, the poem urges the stranger to look carefully at the statue of Anacreon on Teos (Θάσαι...σπουδῇ, 1–2) and to report about it when he returns home. The epigram takes a peculiar twist, however:⁶⁴ it goes on, after the address to the viewer, to mention Anacreon's erotic and pederastic inclinations. Only with the addition of this information can we form a precise image of the poet (see ἀτρεκέως, 6). The epigram thus states explicitly that a thorough viewing of the statue does not suffice to arrive at a correct description of Anacreon. Even more, the opening gambit—the exhortation to view—turns out to be just a game on an ecphrastic *topos*, since, by the end, the reader has encountered no description of the statue, no reference to its life-likeness, never mind any mention of individual attributes.⁶⁵ But this means that an essential facet of Anacreon cannot be communicated through the external image of a person (cp. ἀνδριάντα, 1; εἰκόν', 3), but only through the medium that Anacreon himself served, poetry. Theocritus' epigram thus marshals itself in competition with the statue through its additional reference to his pederastic inclinations. The fame of Anacreon, Theocritus emphasizes, rests upon his erotic poetry and its sympotic context. The exhortation to the passerby “to view carefully” ostensibly has only the statue in mind, while in reality it is concerned with the epigram imagined as an inscription on its base. The epigram itself, in turn, affords an equally thorough vision of Anacreon inasmuch as it claims that it alone can render a complete description of Anacreon. Thus the opening address to an exemplary passerby turns out to be composed not only for people on Teos, but is aimed at Theocritus' readers. The absence of the artist from the poem might also be taken as revealing the poet's art-critical, and finally poetological, intent. Further deviations from the standard pattern might be adduced. The poem's Doric dialect as well as its metrical form clearly distance Theocritus from Anacreon's

⁶³ On the transmission of the *Sylloge* of the bucolic manuscripts, see Rossi (2001: 361–75); on a possible third-century edition of Theocritus' epigrams, see Gutzwiller (1996: 119–38).

⁶⁴ For a general treatment of this epigram with further detail, see Bing (1988a) and Rossi (2001: 279–80).

⁶⁵ On the functionless and incomplete inscriptional elements of this epigram, see Rossi (2001: 280).

Ionic poetry.⁶⁶ The breech here is not only with plastic art, but rather also with the poet Anacreon who is identified here through a peculiar and narrow caricature,⁶⁷ his pederasty. Inasmuch as Theocritus counts Anacreon explicitly among the “old” poets (4), the Hellenistic author reveals a sense of his own modernity.⁶⁸

Among the numerous variations on the selfsame subject or work of art, those on the mythical and literary figures of Niobe and Medea are most prominent. In the plastic arts, both figures appear in an especially striking scene modeled on poetic precedents. In the Hellenistic period, this artistic presentation in turn becomes a topic for epigrams with ecphrastic elements. During that same era, Niobe was presented many times in stone statuary.⁶⁹ The Hellenistic series of Niobe epigrams⁷⁰ does not so much describe or dramatize the viewing of the artwork,⁷¹ as deal with its underlying subject, Niobe, and her hybris.⁷² The artwork acts as a pretext for raising ethical and moral themes, and to present the drastic consequence of Niobe’s errant behavior. Another sequence of Hellenistic and imperial-era epigrams (*AP* 135–143) concerns Timomachus of Byzantium’s painting that, following Euripides’ harrowing scene (*Medea* 1019–80), shows Medea steeled for the murder of her children, sword in hand and profoundly torn. The arrangement of this series is notable. From an incipient understanding of Medea and her motivations to kill her children in the first epigrams, in later epigrams the description slides into lack of comprehension and hatred. This movement can be traced to Stoic ethical discussions on the emotions in response to the famous monologue of Medea going back to the time of Chrysippus (third century B.C.).⁷³

The 36 epigrams on the bronze *Cow* of the classical sculptor Myron (*AP* 9.713–42 and 793–8), the oldest of which are Hellenistic, are

⁶⁶ The epodic structure (iambic trimeter followed by hendecasyllables) constitutes a reminiscence of Anacreon whose poetry in fact used other such combinations (e.g., iambic trimeter followed by hemiepes or ithyphallics); see Bing (1988a: 119–20).

⁶⁷ Rossi (2001: 282–3) gives a literary and critical survey of the reception of Anacreon.

⁶⁸ On the age of poets, see also Herondas 8.78–9, Callimachus *Hymn to Zeus* 60 and fr. 92, 75.54, 194.7 Pf., and Posidippus 63 AB.

⁶⁹ See Pliny, *nat. hist.* 36.28, on which see Ridgway (1990: 82–4, with plates).

⁷⁰ Theodoridas 18 GP (= *AP* 132), Antipater of Thessalonica 87 GP *Garland* (= *AP* 133), Meleager 128 GP (= *AP* 134), and Anonymous 129.

⁷¹ Rossi (2001: 27), Gutzwiller (2002a: 107–9); see esp. Meleager 128 GP (= *AP* 134).

⁷² As, for example, in Aeschylus *TrGF* 3.265–80 [Radt] = fr. 154–167b Radt.

⁷³ Gutzwiller (2004b).

especially famous.⁷⁴ Though they have scant art-historical value, modern research has come to appreciate these epigrams which, as a group, comment on the lifelikeness of this sculpture,⁷⁵ originally installed as a dedication on the Acropolis of Athens. These epigrams pose as inscriptions on the base of the bronze conveying the information one would conventionally expect. But in place of a distinctly ecphrastic description, they attempt to catch the essential impressions left by the sculpture. The work of art thus serves merely as a stimulus to reflect on how one ought to view, consider, and judge the plastic arts (i.e., they work within the “culture of viewing”).⁷⁶ Aesthetic aspects predominate: the effect of the plastic arts on viewers, verisimilitude in artistic imitation, etc. Often, the terms are familiar from poetic theory (such as *ψεύδος*, *ἀπάτη*,⁷⁷ *πλάττειν*),⁷⁸ where they describe the illusionary. Thus the fictionality of poetry, a perennial subject of theoretical discourse, is now applied to an artwork, which is discussed according to the criteria of deception and lying—that is, of illusion.⁷⁹ Myron’s “lie” arises from the confusion between his *Cow* and a real animal, from the fact that the viewer (whether animal or man) errs even when he encounters the *Cow* face to face; and Myron becomes a putative deceiver. Hellenistic praise of the *Cow* reveals the high value placed during this era on verisimilitude in artistic representation. Previously, only quasi-mythical artists such as Daedalus, Hephaestus, and Prometheus had demonstrated

⁷⁴ On material remains and the transmissional history, see Corso (1994: 49–91). Posidippus 66 AB, transmitted apart from *AP* in the *Andriantopoiika* of P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309, may be one of the oldest on Myron’s *Cow*.

⁷⁵ The variations by Antipater of Sidon (*AP* 9.720–4, 728 = 36–40 GP) speak narrowly to what is perhaps the oldest such epigram, Leonidas of Tarentum 88 GP (= *AP* 9.719); on this relationship, see Gutzwiller (1998b: 245–50). On the epigrams’ comments on lifelikeness, see Fuà (1973: 49–55), Speyer (1975: 171–9), Lausberg (1982: 224–5), and Laurens (1989: 83–5), along with the dismissive judgment of Gow-Page (1965: 2.64): “a somewhat tedious competition.” Now, contra, see Gutzwiller (1998b: 245–50) and Männlein-Robert (forthcoming 2007: ch. 4.1). Pliny traces the fame of the *Cow* back to the epigrams themselves (*nat. hist.* 34.57: *Myronem...bucula maxime nobilitavit, celebratis versibus laudata quando alieno plerique ingenio magis quam suo commendantur*).

⁷⁶ Goldhill (1994), Gutzwiller (2002a), and Zanker (2004).

⁷⁷ See, for example, “Anacreon” *AP* 9.716.2: σφετέρῃ ψεύσατο χειρὶ Μύρων (on the dating of this poem to the Hellenistic period, see Page (1981: 146) and Cameron (1993: 2)); Leonidas of Tarentum 88.1 GP (= *AP* 9.719.1): οὐκ ἐπλάσεν με Μύρων, ἐνψύσατο; cp. also Anonymous *AP* 9.737, 741, Julianus *AP* 9.739, and Dioscorides *AP* 9.734.

⁷⁸ E.g., *AP* 9.718–9, 723, 726; cp. 727, 732, 734, 736; cp. also *πλάττειν* in Antipater of Sidon 40 GP (= *AP* 9.724).

⁷⁹ Illusion, so far as ancient literary criticism is concerned, comes above all through the use of “likely details” (realistic touches) to create a “real” atmosphere (on which, Barthes (1968: 84–9)).

the talent to produce works of art imbued with such lifelikeness. Now and forevermore an historical and human artist could take his place alongside these mythical and divine exemplars.⁸⁰

We begin the bovine sequence with a Hellenistic variant wrongly ascribed to Anacreon (*AP* 9.716)—

Βοίδιον οὐ χοάνοις τετυπωμένον, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ γήρως
χαλκῶθεν σφετέρῃ ψεύσατο χειρὶ Μύρων.

Myron pretended this heifer was the work of his hands,
but it was never cast in molds; it turned to bronze due to old age⁸¹—

together with an epigram by the Hellenistic poet Leonidas of Tarentum, first half of the third century B.C. (88 GP = *AP* 9.719):

Οὐκ ἔπλασέν με Μύρων· ἐψεύσατο, βοσκομένην δέ
ἐξ ἀγέλας ἐλάσας δῆσε βάσει λιθίνῃ.

Myron did not make me; he was lying. While I was at pasture
he drove me from the herd and attached me to a stone base.

The mention of “bronze” in the first epigram makes it unmistakably clear that, in dealing with the cow, the poem is really concerned with an artwork, something also evident in the naming of the artist, Myron, as well as in the use of the technical terms of artistic production, such as χοάνοις τετυπωμένον (“cast in molds”). But “Anacreon” immediately eliminates the impression that the poem deals with an artifact: its effect was produced not through *technê* (art), but through a metamorphosis into a bronze, the freezing of a living, aged animal. Myron’s “lie” thus consists of saying that a work of nature was really a work of art he produced. The discussion of lifelikeness and the realistic presentation of artworks, well known from ecphrastic contexts, here gives way to the old poetological discourse on truth and deceit that had circulated from the time of Hesiod and dealt with “lying” poets, their influence on the soul of the public (*psychagogia*), as well as the particulars of poetic truth.⁸² Since Plato, critics had paired the lying, imitative poets with the equally deceptive plastic artists in the polemic against them.

Leonidas also charges Myron with “lying.” According to his *Cow*, who after all was an eyewitness and thus ought to have first-hand knowledge,

⁸⁰ On anecdotes on artists, see Kris-Kurz (1934 [repr. 1995]: 89–99).

⁸¹ Translation after Paton (1916–19: 3.395).

⁸² Fuller account in Rösler (1980).

the artist tied her fast to a stone platform and so represented what was really a work of nature as his own. Here the terms *πλάττειν*, *ψεύδεσθαι*, and *ψεύδος* speak not just to the matter of Myron's truthfulness and the success of the art work's ability to create an illusion, but are relevant also to corresponding questions dealt with in contemporary poetics:⁸³ i.e., poetical principles are here applied to a work of art and reflected from the perspective of the theory of sensory perception. However, an epigram by Antipater (of Thessalonica)⁸⁴ highlights the relationship between poetry and the plastic arts (84 GP *Garland* = *AP* 9.728):

ἅ δάμαλις δοκέω μυκήσεται· ἦν δὲ βραδύνῃ
χαλκὸς ὁ μὴ νοέων αἴτιος, οὐχὶ Μύρων.

The heifer, I think, is about to moo; but if it takes its time
it's the fault of the senseless bronze, not Myron's.

In this instance, the poet has us consider a—real—cow's lowing, which, of course, we never actually hear; and so the epigram locates the cause for this failure in the bronze's lack of capabilities in (sensory as well as mental) perception.⁸⁵ The materiality of the cow points anew to one of the clear restrictions of plastic art: even if Myron is capable of creating a deceptively lifelike cow, he is still incapable of giving the material, bronze, one of the essential characteristics of liveliness, the ability to speak aloud. Here, the criterion of "voice" assumes a key role alongside others having to do with liveliness, such as movement and vision (cp. Erinna 3 GP = *AP* 6.352 and Posidippus 63 AB). The epigram thus emphasizes once more the deficiency of an artwork. Taken as a whole, it is clear that the epigrams on Myron's *Cow* are purely literary texts; the *Cow*, a famous work known well to contemporary readers, serves only as a vehicle for originally poetological categories and concerns.⁸⁶ Ecphrastic epigrams thus offer us partial evidence for reconstructing Hellenistic poetics. Here also, we discern in the medium of poetry itself contemporary interest in critically comparing the sister arts (*paragone*).⁸⁷

⁸³ Meijering (1987), Puglisi (1985); on "lying" as a matter to be taken up by poets, see Callimachus, e.g., *Hymn to Zeus* 65; 31.4 GP (= *Ep.* 13.4 Pf. = *AP* 7.524.4); cp. also Theocritus *Id.* 7.44 (πᾶν ἐπ' ἀλαθείᾳ πεπλασμένον ἐκ Διὸς ἔρνος).

⁸⁴ So Gow-Page (1968: 2.86), with reasonable doubts; *contra* see Argentieri (2003: 142).

⁸⁵ In accord with the basic definition of νοεῖν, on which see LSJ s.v. (1), with references to, e.g., Aristotle *de an.* 427a26–7 and Homer *Il.* 3.396.

⁸⁶ Schwarz (1971: *passim*) and Hebert (1989: *passim*) are at pains to attempt an art-historical reconstruction, against which Rossi (2001: 25–7) rightly argues.

⁸⁷ See the section above on characteristics and tendencies. On the renaissance term

These reflect on the value of sensory impressions in contemplating works of art: it is only the internal viewer in the epigrams on Myron's *Cow* who suffers the illusion that he is dealing with a real cow. A more distanced speaker, not further identified, typically points out this error, for he understands what is artful about this particular work and can draw attention to it, while never constructing any sort of emotional relationship with it. On the one hand, then, the poem makes it clear that deception and illusion are based upon the sensory perception (αἴσθησις) of the viewer alone; on the other, it sets this errant viewing against the act of "correct" viewing. Narrated by a speaker whose perspective echoes that of a knowledgeable exegete, this articulation presents a reflective, intellectual "seeing" (*phantasia*) and constitutes a new mode of viewing art in which the recipient comes to the fore as an authoritative judge. As a viewer, he must transgress the bounds of purely sensory perception and thereby grasp the illusionary character of an artwork even as he enjoys the artfulness of the illusion. The epigrams demonstrate that such a process of reflection is possible only through the media of speech and writing, which their poetry itself serves. In sum, then, the ecphrastic epigrams on Myron's *Cow* reproduce reflexes of contemporary poetological and philosophical thought, as well as the latent competition between poetry and plastic art.⁸⁸

On the Relationship Between the Arts

Ecphrastic epigrams demonstrate that the relationship between the so-called "sister arts" was substantially more complex already in the Hellenistic age than heretofore assumed. That relationship fluctuates between analogy (as, for example, with Nossis), complementarity (e.g., Posidippus), and contest (e.g., the epigrams on Myron's *Cow*), the last of which comes to the fore particularly in cases dealing with programmatic statements by poets on their own art and medium. The genre of ecphrastic epigram plays a leading role in delineating this complex since it naturally involves the relationship between the media of voice, writing, and image. Indeed, the epigrams even come to express contemporary

"paragone," first used by Leonardo da Vinci, and on the quarrel between the sister arts it describes, see Sprigath (2004).

⁸⁸ For a more discursive treatment on this, see Männlein-Robert (forthcoming 2007: chap. 4.1.5).

philosophical and literary-aesthetic discussions. Hellenistic ecphrastic epigrams thus prove to be poetologically and literary-critically relevant texts that reveal important insights into the self-understanding of Hellenistic poets and their work.

The long *Nachleben* of Hellenistic ecphrastic epigrams can be shown through an early imperial example by Geminus from the *Garland* of Philip. The poem reveals how the post-Hellenistic age could compete with its predecessors, deploying notable *topoi* and enshrining them in epigram (Geminus 6 GP *Garland* = *APL* 30):

χείρ με Πολυγνώτου Θασίου κάμεν· εἰμὶ δ' ἐκεῖνος
 Σαλμωνεύς, βρονταῖς ὃς Διὸς ἀντεμάνην,
 ὅς με καὶ εἰν Ἄϊδι πορθεῖ πάλι καί με κεραυνοῖς
 βάλλει μισῶν μου κοῦ λαλέοντα τύπον.
 ἴσχε, Ζεῦ, πρηστήρα, μέθες χόλον, εἰμὶ γὰρ ἄπνους
 ὁ σκόπος, ἀψύχοις εἰκόσι μὴ πολέμει.

The hand of Thasian Polygnotus made me. I am that
 Salmoneus who raged against the thunders of Zeus,
 who destroys me again even in Hades and strikes me with lightning,
 since he hates my image even though it can't speak.
 Stop, Zeus! Relent in your anger! For your target—me!—
 is unbreathing. Stop waging war against lifeless images!⁸⁹

In this dramatized scene, the mythical Thessalian hero Salmoneus addresses his adversary, Zeus, directly, since the god threatens to destroy him with a lightning bolt. The speaker, who is dead, delivers essential information on the scene (Hades, lightning-tossing Zeus) and on the background of the event portrayed in Polygnotus' painting (his attack on Zeus with the latter's lightning bolts and Zeus' revenge which cost Salmoneus his life).⁹⁰ The painted hero draws attention to his creator Polygnotus and to the medium in which he is depicted, a painting. A witty feature of the poem is thus that Salmoneus speaks, only to say that he is a dumb and lifeless reproduction (μου κοῦ λαλέοντα τύπον, 4; ἀψύχοις εἰκόσι, 6), a joke which alludes simultaneously to his imaginary existence in Hades in his artistic representation. Thus there is a conspicuous play with terminology of (re)presentation (cp. τύπον, 4; εἰκόσι, 6), not to mention the paradoxical speaking of an expressly dumb painting (cp. κοῦ λαλέοντα, 4). The poem draws our attention to

⁸⁹ Translation after Gow-Page (1968: 1.265).

⁹⁰ On speaking objects from the very beginning of the (inscribed) epigrams see more detailed Burzachechi (1962); Häusle (1979b).

the artist's hand, a *topos* in such epigrams,⁹¹ and emphasizes the artistry of his work. More importantly, perhaps, it highlights the self-referentiality⁹² of the—speaking—work of art as a characteristic proper to Hellenistic ecphrastic epigram. Of course, the voice of the dumb painting of Salmoneus becomes audible—or rather visible—only through the (written) epigram. The net effect? Once more, in the poem's voice we hear that competitive tension, recognizable from the earliest date in the Hellenistic period, between the media of image and text.

⁹¹ E.g., Erinna 3 GP (= AP 6.352), Parrhasius 2 *FGE*, Anonymous AP 13.17; Apollonius of Rhodes 3.135–6.

⁹² On the self-referentiality of ecphrastic epigrams see the interpretation of Echo-epigrams in Gutzwiller (2002a: 104–7).

PART THREE

GENRE

TELL, ALL YE SINGERS, MY FAME KINGS, QUEENS AND NOBILITY IN EPIGRAM

Annemarie Ambühl

How are great kings to be praised within the small compass of an epigram? The present contribution aims at illustrating some of the solutions the Hellenistic epigrammatists employed to deal with this problem which for them presented itself on a scale markedly different from Theocritus' hymnic encomium on Ptolemy Philadelphus with its opening expansive priamel of a veritable forest of themes (*Id.* 17.1–12). Indeed, at the beginning of one of his longer epinician epigrams on the Ptolemies' Olympic victories, Posidippus in a more economical way has Berenice herself urge “all singers” to “tell” her “fame,” “if ever it pleases” them “to speak of what is known” (78.1–2 AB):¹

ἐ[ῖ]πατε, πάντες ἀοιδοί, ἐμὸν [κ]λέος, ἐ[ῖ] π[ο]τ' ἀρέσκει
γνωστὰ λέγειν, ὅτι μοι δόξ[α παλαιόγονος·

At the end, she invites the “Macedonians” to perform her victory “song” (13–4: ἀείδετε..., ὦ Μακέτα[ι]), thus completing the triangle patron, poet and audience. The words Posidippus puts into the mouth of the queen serve as a suitable epigraph for this study, for they express in an oblique way the complex task encountered by the Alexandrian epigrammatist: how to treat panegyric topics in a manner that suits the needs and wishes of the royal patron as well as the literary ambitions of the poet, the expectations of the audience, and the exigencies of the genre.

In recent years, the issues of court poetry and patronage have found renewed interest in Hellenistic scholarship.² This holds true

¹ On the speaker's identity, most probably Berenice II, see Bastianini and Gallazzi (2001: 206); cf. below n. 12. The term ἀοιδοί seems to associate the epigrammatist with epic and lyric “singers” (cf. Theocr. 17.2, 6).

² The tradition of literary patronage in Greece from the courts of the archaic tyrants down to the Hellenistic age is sketched in Gold (1987: 15–38), Gentili (1988: 115–76) and Weber (1992) and (1993: 33–53). For the Ptolemaic court, besides Fraser (1972: 1.305–35; 553–617), the standard work is Weber (1993); see also Weber (1997) on Hellenistic courts in general. Cameron (1995: 3–103) emphasizes the role of the

especially for Alexandrian poetry, which has been subjected to diametrically opposed political interpretations, ranging from subversive, anti-Ptolemaic readings, a view which has become rather obsolete,³ to ideological readings which assign Ptolemaic poetry a crucial function in maintaining the Greek cultural heritage in an alien environment or even in promoting the court's Egyptianizing view of kingship among the Greek population.⁴ Although these readings have focused mainly on "bigger" genres like epic or hymns, especially Apollonius' *Argonautica*, Callimachus' *Hymns* and Theocritus' *Idylls*, certain epigrams have convincingly been interpreted in a Ptolemaic context as well.⁵ Instead of being reduced to mere instruments for conveying political messages, these poems are now assessed as sophisticated works of art exhibiting multiple layers of meaning.

As in other fields related to the study of Hellenistic epigram, the publication of the Milan papyrus containing more than one hundred previously unknown epigrams by Posidippus has fuelled a surge of interest in the issue of patronage.⁶ In view of the marked focus on the female members of the dynasty, the papyrus may even represent a collection of epigrams dedicated to a Ptolemaic queen.⁷ To address

Hellenistic courts in providing occasions for the performance of poetry. Reviews of recent scholarship are to be found in Hose (1997) and Strootman (2001); see also Strootman (forthcoming 2007a) and (forthcoming 2007b). In the introduction to her commentary on the encomiastic elegies *SH* 958 and 969, Barbantani (2001: 3–61) gives an excellent overview of Hellenistic court poetry.

³ Schwinge (1986), who linked this idea with the equally outdated concept of Hellenistic poetry as *l'art pour l'art*. For a more balanced view of the poets' role at the Ptolemaic court see Weber (1993).

⁴ Among recent studies on Callimachus, Theocritus and Apollonius in their Ptolemaic context, see especially Bing (1988b), Hunter (1993) and (1996), Selden (1998), Harder (2003) and Stephens (2003).

⁵ See, e.g., Gutzwiller's (1992c) subtle interpretation of Callimachus' epigram on the nautilus shell dedicated to Arsinoë Zephyritis by the girl Selenaië (14 GP = 5 Pf.); cf. below, p. 282.

⁶ P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309, in Bastianini and Gallazzi (2001); text and translation—the latter sometimes modified with the aid of Nisetich (2005)—are quoted here from the *editio minor* by Austin and Bastianini (2002). I adhere to the view that all the epigrams are by Posidippus (*contra* Schröder (2004)). Among the contributions to the various congress volumes devoted to the New Posidippus—including Bastianini (2002); Acosta-Hughes, Kosmetatou and Baumbach (2004); Di Marco, Palumbo Stracca and Lelli (2005); Gutzwiller (2005c)—of special relevance for the issue of patronage are Bingen (2002), Fantuzzi (2004a) and (2005); see also Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 377–403), Kosmetatou (2004b) and (2004c), Stephens (2004a), (2005) (see also (2004b)), Bing (2005), Gutzwiller (2005a) and (2005b), Kuttner (2005), Lelli (2005), Meliadò (2005) and Thompson (2005).

⁷ Thus Bing (2005: 140); Gutzwiller (2005a: 15). For the prominence of the Ptolemaic queens in the collection, see Fantuzzi (2004a) and (2005), Stephens (2004a), (2004b)

the substantial lack of external evidence, the new epigrams have often been studied for information about the historical background of the poet, his patrons and his audience, and to explore their relationship to Ptolemaic ideology. The issues raised by the New Posidippus may profitably be applied to the epigrams composed by his contemporaries as well. Since these do not regularly foreground Ptolemaic themes in such an explicit way as the Milan Posidippus, his example may help to draw attention to more indirect modes of addressing Ptolemaic themes. Moreover, it has become evident from papyrological finds that the selection of epigrams contained in the *Garlands* of Meleager and Philip does not reflect the original range of possible topics; epigrams specifically associated with the first Ptolemies were no longer of interest to a later audience.⁸ Although it is of course idle to speculate about lost Ptolemaic epigrams by Callimachus and his contemporaries, it is important to bear in mind that what remains of their output is only a fraction of the whole picture.

In the present essay, I take a fresh look at some Hellenistic epigrams in the light of the New Posidippus, juxtaposing related topics or modes of composition and setting them into the context of Ptolemaic literature.⁹ Instead of approaching the epigrams from a primarily historical angle, I focus on the ways in which contemporary reality is reflected and transformed by means of poetry. By analyzing the internal system of communication the epigrams employ, I explore the relationship between patron, poet and audience as it is mirrored within the text. In particular, I examine how kings, queens and members of the nobility are portrayed in the different sub-genres of epigram, paying special attention to gender distinctions. Finally, I add some thoughts on the patronage of Hellenistic epigrammatists in the Roman context.

and (2005), Gutzwiller (2005b) and Thompson (2005). P.Petrie II 49a (= Posidippus *114 AB = *SH* 961) containing an elegiac epithalamium for Arsinoe II on the recto and the heading *Symmeikta epigrammata* followed by the name of Posidippus on the verso may represent another collection of epigrams offered to Arsinoe on her wedding; cf. Gutzwiller (1998b: 25, 45, 156), (2005a: 6–7), (2005b: 311–2); and Parsons (2002: 106, 117, 120, 125).

⁸ See, e.g., Parsons (2002); Bing (2002/3: 255); Stephens (2004b: 66); Krevans (2005: 83–6).

⁹ By concentrating once again on Ptolemaic epigram, I do not imply that the other Hellenistic courts did not have epigrammatic traditions of their own, for which there is, however, much less evidence; on the Antigonids at Pella see Weber (1995); on the Attalids at Pergamum and the dedicatory epigram *SGO* 06/02/05 see Barbantani (2001: 47–8).

1. *Patronage as a system of communication: dedicatory epigrams*

Literary patronage can be defined as a system of communication and exchange between a patron, a poet and an audience in a specific historical context.¹⁰ On their fictional internal plane, however, the Ptolemaic epigrams do not address the issue of patronage in a direct and explicit manner; rather, patronage forms the unstated precondition of their composition. This fits in with the observation of Arnd Kerkhecker that Ptolemaic court poetry is mainly poetry originating in the context of the court and in some cases composed for court occasions, but not poetry about the daily life at court as in parallel instances of court poetry from different historical and cultural contexts.¹¹ Nevertheless, in some cases the persons mentioned in the epigrams can be identified with historical figures. In the first place these are the Ptolemies themselves; the existence of namesakes in different generations may cause some ambiguities, as is especially the case with the queen or princess Berenice who occupies a prominent place in Posidippus' epinician epigrams.¹² Other epigrams mention prominent personalities of the Ptolemaic court like Callicrates of Samos, the admiral, first eponymous priest of the dynastic cult of Alexander and the *Theoi Adelphoi* and dedicator of the temple of Arsinoe Aphrodite on Cape Zephyrium, or Sostratus of Cnidos, a court functionary involved in the dedication of the lighthouse on the island Pharos.¹³ Further research may well discover additional historical connections.¹⁴

¹⁰ Studies on ancient patronage have focused mainly on Roman culture, from whence the terminology derives; in the whole field of patronage, literary patronage forms only one type among others; see, e.g., the essays in Gold (1982) and Wallace-Hadrill (1989). The sociological model of patronage as a system of communication between poet, patron and audience adopted by Nauta (2002) in his book on literary patronage in the age of Domitian can, however, be applied to Hellenistic patronage as well.

¹¹ Kerkhecker (1997), who, however, views Posidippus as a partial exception to the rule.

¹² The editors identify her with Berenice II, wife of Ptolemy III Euergetes (Bastianini and Gallazzi (2001: 205–6); Austin and Bastianini (2002: 102, 104); cf. now Lelli (2005: 123–4, n. 161)), whereas Criscuolo (2003) and Thompson (2005) prefer Berenice the Syrian, sister of Ptolemy III and future wife of Antiochus II. The issue is not crucial to my argument.

¹³ On Callicrates, mentioned in Posidippus 39, 74, 116 and 119 AB, see now Bing (2002/3); according to the new reading of Posidippus 115 AB (= 11 GP) by Bing (1998), Sostratus dedicated only the statue of Zeus Soter crowning the Pharos.

¹⁴ For instance, the doctor Medeius in Posidippus 95 AB has been identified with an important personality at Philadelphus' court (Bing (2002a) and (2004); cf. Stephens (2004b: 79–82)); another doctor, Philippus in Callimachus 3 GP (= *AP* 12.150 = 46 Pf.), seems to be connected to the court, as well; Etearchus in Posidippus 76 AB is

In this way, more and more threads in a widespread network of relations are being disentangled.

However, beyond the historical background, what is of interest in this context are the modes in which each epigram establishes its own implicit relationship between its various *personae*. For instance, dedicatory epigrams usually feature a speaker who may be the dedicator, the votive object speaking in the first person, or an impersonal voice recording the dedication; an addressee who in most cases is identical with the dedicatee; and sometimes a wider audience that is invited to acknowledge the dedication and may also act as an internal substitute for the external reader.¹⁵ The different roles within the text may of course reflect the extra-textual circumstances of composition, but rather than simply reporting the act of dedication, the epigrams present a poetically transformed version of the occasion.

As a sample, I analyze the various dedicatory epigrams connected to the temple of Arsinoe Aphrodite on Cape Zephyrium.¹⁶ While some of them explicitly name the temple or the goddess (Posidippus 37, 39, 116, 119 AB; Callimachus 14 GP; Hedylus 4 GP), an analogous connection has been inferred for other dedications to the deified Arsinoe (Posidippus 36, 38 AB) or to Aphrodite Urania (Dioscorides 14 GP).¹⁷ It is worth remembering here that epigram is the genre most appropriate to dedications and thus the ideal medium for conveying the various aspects of this new Ptolemaic cult, which obviously prompted different occasions for the composition of epigrams. In the external world, these epigrams are likely to have served as a means of communication between the Ptolemies, the court and the educated citizens not only of

probably a Ptolemaic nomarch (Thompson (2005: 279–80)). For the prosopography of the Ptolemaic court and its reflection in contemporary poetry see Weber (1993: 130–54, 283–301); Barbantani (2001: 44–7).

¹⁵ Day (2000) studies the internal and external contexts of reception with regard to archaic dedicatory epigrams, von Hesberg (1981: esp. 67–81) with regard to Hellenistic architectural epigrams. On reader participation see Meyer (1993) and (2005) and Bing (1995b).

¹⁶ On the temple and the epigrams commemorating it see Fraser (1972: 1.239–40, 568–9, 571); von Hesberg (1981: 63, 70–2, 81–2); Weber (1993: 256–60); Gutzwiller (1992c); Bastianini and Gallazzi (2001: 150–5); Bing (2002/3); Gigante Lanzara (2003); Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 377–91); Schröder (2004: 30, 32, 37–40); Stephens (2004a) and (2005: 236–48). On their relation to other Alexandrian poems on Arsinoe II, see Lelli (2002: esp. 17–23) and (2005: 85–7, 119–23).

¹⁷ Posidippus 110 AB (1: ἡ Ζεφύρῳ) is associated with the same context by Lapini (2004) and Gutzwiller (2005b: 317); the remains are, however, too scanty to draw any conclusions about the content.

Alexandria but of the whole Ptolemaic empire. Naturally, this presupposes a wider circulation of the texts beyond the court, for which there is indeed some evidence.¹⁸

In their internal system of communication, the interaction between the roles of dedicator, dedicatee and public manifests itself in varying constellations. First, let us have a look at the epigrams centering on the temple itself, all by Posidippus. 39 and 119 AB both present the dedication and the function of the temple from an “objective” perspective, whereas 116 AB has the temple speak in its own voice, recounting the narrative of the foundation in a roughly chronological order. In contrast, 39 and 119 AB start immediately with an address to the worshippers; moreover, both epigrams exhibit an almost imperceptible syntactic shift from the temple towards the goddess, who thus becomes the object of dedication herself:¹⁹

καὶ μέλλων ἄλα νηὶ περᾶν καὶ πείσμα καθάπτειν
 χερσόθεν, Εὐπλοΐαι ‘χαῖρε’ δὸς Ἀρσινόῃ,
 πόλτιαν ἐκ νηοῦ καλέων θεόν, ἣν ὁ Βοΐσκου
 ναυαρχῶν Σάμιος θήκατο Καλλικράτης,

...

(39.1–4 AB)

Whether you are about to cross the sea in a ship or to fasten the cable
 from the shore, say “Greetings” to Arsinoe of Fair Sailing,
 invoking the lady from her temple, the goddess whom
 the Samian admiral Callicrates son of Boiscus consecrated,

...

τοῦτο καὶ ἐν πόντῳ καὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ τῆς Φιλαδέλφου
 Κύπριδος ἰλάσκεσθ’ ἱερὸν Ἀρσινόης,
 ἣν ἀνακοιρανέουσιν ἐπὶ Ζεφυρίτιδος ἀκτῆς
 πρῶτος ὁ ναύαρχος θήκατο Καλλικράτης·

...

(119.1–4 AB)

¹⁸ Notably, with the exception of Dioscorides 14 GP (= *AP* 6.290), none of them was included in the later Anthologies. Instead they are found on nearly contemporary papyri dating from the third and second century B.C.: Posidippus 36–9 AB on P.Mil. Vogl. VIII 309; 116 AB (= 12 GP) and 115 AB (= 11 GP) on Pharos are on P.Louvre 7172 [P. Didot]), while others are quoted by Athenaeus in a Ptolemaic context (Calimachus 14 GP and Posidippus 119 AB at Athen. 7.318b–d; Hedylus 4 GP at Athen. 11.497d). On the papyri and their readers see Thompson (1987), Gutzwiller (1998b: 20–36), Parsons (2002), and Johnson (2005). Some of these epigrams may even have been inscribed on the actual monuments (Bing (1998); Obbink (2004a) and (2005)).

¹⁹ Except Nisetich (2005), most translators gloss over this shift; curiously, Austin and Bastianini (2002) render it accurately in 119 AB, but not in the parallel case in 39 AB.

Both on land and on sea keep in your prayers
 this shrine of Aphrodite Arsinoe Philadelphus.
 She it was, ruling over the Zephyrian promontory,
 whom Callicrates, the admiral, was the first to consecrate.
 ...

Perhaps this implies that Callicrates in addition to the temple also dedicated a statue of the goddess.²⁰ Likewise, after pointing out the location of the temple, 116 AB insists on the appellation of the new goddess that will constitute her future identity:

ἔνθα με Καλλικράτης ἰδρύσατο καὶ βασιλίσσης
 ἱερὸν Ἀρσινόης Κύπριδος ὠνόμασεν.
 ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν Ζεφυρίτιν ἀκουσομένην Ἀφροδίτην,
 ...

(116.5–7 AB)

Here Callicrates set me up and called me the shrine
 of Queen Arsinoe Aphrodite.
 So then, to her who shall be named Zephyritis Aphrodite,
 ...

Thus, besides commemorating the dedication of the temple, in the first place the three epigrams reenact the creation of the goddess, emphasizing that now it is up to the public to acknowledge her and to benefit from her powers by evoking her from her temple, in a cletic hymn so to speak (39.3 AB: πό]ττιαν ἐκ νηοῦ καλέων θεόν).²¹ Accordingly, each epigram addresses the future worshippers directly. 39 and 119 AB are again parallel in addressing sailors and travelers on land and on sea, whereas 116 AB invites both the ritually pure daughters of the Greeks and men who toil on the sea to visit the temple (8–9: Ἑλλήνων ἀγναί, βαίνετε, θυγατέρες, / οἳ θ' ἄλως ἐργάται ἄνδρες). The gender distinction between male and female addressees contributes towards defining the character of the goddess Arsinoe Aphrodite, for her cult combines two separate aspects associated with the sea in Greek thought. On the one hand, the temple founded by the admiral Callicrates has a political function connected to the Ptolemaic maritime empire; on the other

²⁰ Whereas Sostratus seems to have dedicated only the statue of Zeus Soter atop the Pharos (above n. 13), 116 AB unequivocally ascribes the dedication of the temple to Callicrates.

²¹ On the cletic hymn see Cairns (1972: 192–3), who quotes Posidippus 139 AB (= 8 GP = *AP* 12.131), an invocation of Aphrodite. Schröder's conjecture ἐκ νηός is therefore unnecessary (2004: 37, n. 40).

hand, on a metaphorical plane Arsinoe Aphrodite guides young girls safely through the sea of love towards marriage.²² Consequently, the last line of the epigram combines both meanings, the literal as well as the metaphorical, in the image of the harbor that promises safety from all waves (116.10 AB: τοῦθ' ἱερὸν παντὸς κύματος εὐλίμενον).

A parallel confluence of imagery occurs in Callimachus 14 GP, where a nautilus shell found at the Ptolemaic naval base Iulis on Ceos (renamed Arsinoe) and subsequently dedicated to Arsinoe Zephyritis by Selenaië, the daughter of Cleinias, perhaps an officer of the fleet, speaks in terms suggestive of marriage and reproduction.²³ This crossover of gender roles inherent in the cult of Arsinoe testifies to the complex public image of the Ptolemaic queens.²⁴ In an overall perspective, it might however be tempting to view the temple of Arsinoe Aphrodite containing her statue and the lighthouse on Pharos topped with a statue of Zeus Soter as a female-male pair corresponding to the royal couple of Arsinoe and Ptolemy Philadelphus, just as the two respective epigrams by Posidippus (115 and 116 AB) are juxtaposed in the Didot papyrus.²⁵

Posidippus 36 AB exhibits a similar intersection between the public sphere of war and the private world of marriageable girls.²⁶ In a dream, Arsinoe in the attire of a warrior goddess appears to the Macedonian upper-class girl Hegeso, asking her for a piece of cloth to wipe her sweat which is subsequently duly consecrated by the maiden, presumably in the temple on Cape Zephyrium. The armed Arsinoe has been associated with statues of Athena or Aphrodite, and the votive object has been identified as the Macedonian diadem, a headband worn by Alexander

²² On the two aspects of the cult see Gutzwiller (1992c: esp. 198–202 on the sea-of-love metaphor); Bing (2002/3: esp. 245, 255–60).

²³ See Gutzwiller (1992c). On the Ptolemaic background of Iulis see also Fraser (1972: 1.587).

²⁴ On the official role of the deified Ptolemaic queens and especially Arsinoe II, see, e.g., Fraser (1972: 1.213–46); Pomeroy (1984: 3–40); Weber (1993: 251–69); Hazzard (2000: 82–159).

²⁵ On the personal anthology contained in the Didot papyrus (above n. 18) see Thompson (1987); specifically on the two epigrams by Posidippus see Bing (1998) and Obbink (2004a) and (2005: 104–8). Peter Bing suggests to me that the reference in 116.1 AB to the temple's location midway between Pharos and Canopus could also be a metapoetic comment on the poem's original position on the scroll between poems on the statue of Zeus on the Pharos and on some Ptolemaic dedication at Canopus. Note, e.g., the votive epigram for the "Canopian god" (Sarapis or Adonis) by Callimachus (16 GP = AP 6.148 = 55 PF).

²⁶ An amatory context for Hegeso's dream has been suggested by Lelli (2002: 21–2) and Bing (2002/3: 257–60); cf. Angiò (2004); Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 379–83).

and the Ptolemaic queens as a symbol of royal power.²⁷ Arsinoe may thus appear to Hegeso in the guise of the very statue dedicated by Callicrates and the epigram constitute the *aition* of a specific feature of her iconography, be it the panoply or the headband alone.²⁸ In any case, the intimate scene between Arsinoe and Hegeso is made public by the epigram; in this way, the active part taken by the goddess and the girl's appropriate response function as an ideal model for the process of communication enacted by the dedicatory epigrams.

In these texts, the functions of dedicator, dedicatee and addressees are intricately interwoven and dependent upon each other. By naming Callicrates as the one who was the first to consecrate the goddess Arsinoe in her role (119.4 AB: *πρῶτος*) and by assuring the potential worshippers that their prayers will be answered (39.8 AB: *εὐχὰς εὐρήσεις τὴν ἐπακουσομένην*, cf. 119.5–6 AB), the epigrams commemorating the foundation of the temple “officially” establish its function as a recipient for future dedications, which will naturally be on a smaller scale compared to the dedication of the temple itself. The epigrams recording individual offerings respond to this challenge by testifying to the actual power of the goddess, regardless whether the initiative for their production was taken by the respective dedicators or by the epigrammatists themselves inspired by some unusual votive object on display in the temple. Besides the epigrams by Callimachus (14 GP) and Posidippus (36 AB) mentioned above, Posidippus 37 AB records the miraculous rescue of a lyre from the sea by a dolphin and

²⁷ So Stephens (2004a: 166–9), (2004b: 68, 84–5), and (2005: 236–43), who associates Arsinoe with Athena rather than with Aphrodite. Both armed deities may reflect a Spartan background (Lelli (2002: 22); Bing (2002/3: 260); Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 381–3); cf. Pirenne-Delforge (1994: 196–211)). On the association of the queens with martial goddesses in Alexandrian literature in general see Depew (2004: 125–35).

²⁸ Stephens (2004a: 168) and (2005: 241) thinks it possible that the epigram alludes to a specific cult statue of an armed Arsinoe (similarly Livrea (2002: 72)), although she refers to the Alexandrian Arsinoion, on whose possibly unfinished state see Fraser (1972: 1.25; 2.72–5), rather than to the temple on Cape Zephyrium (but see Stephens (2005: 247) on the single cult statue there). Cf. also the omen of the sweating statue in Posidippus 30 AB and the “epiphany” of Athena’s statue moving her foot in front of her temple in 31 AB, as well as the statue of Athena imagined as the goddess herself who returning from battle washes her sweating horses in Callimachus’ *Bath of Pallas* (*H.* 5.1–12). On epiphanies of gods resembling their statues and the ritual washing and clothing of statues see Gladigow (1985/6) and (1990) and Versnel (1987: esp. 46–7); on dreams about statues in dedicatory inscriptions see van Straten (1976: esp. 14–6) and Renberg (forthcoming). Curiously, Ptolemaeus, who copied Posidippus 115 and 116 AB, recounts a dream connected to the statue of Zeus Soter on the Pharos (Bing 1998: 30–1).

its subsequent dedication to Arsinoe by her temple-guard, while in 38 AB a freedwoman offers to Arsinoe in her role as a protector of freedom the cup from which she first drank the water of freedom.²⁹ Not water, but wine is the concern of the young men invited to admire the ingenious drinking horn shaped in the form of the Egyptian god Bes by the engineer Ctesibius and dedicated in the temple of Arsinoe in Hedylus 4 GP. Presumably in the same temple, in Dioscorides 14 GP the hetaera Parmenis dedicates a fan to Aphrodite Urania, perhaps in hope of marriage.³⁰

The various dedicators are thus characterized by a considerable range in social status and gender. As has been suggested for the section of the Milan Posidippus dealing with omens (*oionoskopika*), the variety of figures within the epigrams may function as a substitute for a wide readership.³¹ Moreover, the distinction between the specific material offerings by individual dedicators recorded in the votive epigrams and the immaterial prayers of an unspecified wider audience in the epigrams commemorating the foundation of the temple (Posidippus 39, 116 and 119 AB) is analogous to the function of the epigrams. On the one hand, in line with the origins of the genre, they purport to be inscriptions recording specific occasions, be they fictitious or not; on the other hand, they are intended to circulate in book form and thus to reach a wider audience not acquainted with the material objects. Just as the prayers reach the goddess in her Egyptian temple from the sea, Posidippus' epigram book will travel overseas toward his Macedonian homeland, and beyond.³²

In the system of communication inherent in the epigrams, the epigrammatist functions as a mediator between the Ptolemies and the public, sometimes assuming a didactic stance,³³ but rarely ever speaking about himself in an explicit manner. Nevertheless, by means of literary references to poets or genres associated with the Greek tradition of patronage he may hint at his relationship to his patrons. As has

²⁹ For a political interpretation of 38 AB see Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 383–4).

³⁰ So Gow-Page (1965: 2.245); cf. Gutzwiller (1992c: 198, n. 12). For another dedication to Aphrodite Urania, see Theocritus 2 GP, below, p. 291.

³¹ Baumbach and Trampedach (2004: 129–30). Stephens (2004a: 176) and (2004b: 66) applies an analogous concept to the whole collection.

³² On Posidippus' "geopoetics" see Stephens (2004a: 170–3) and (2005: 231–6); Bing (2005: esp. 124–5, 131–2); Thompson (2005: 280–3).

³³ So Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 385–8), who assign the epigrams a similar function as "paradigms for how the goddess should be honoured in the future."

been noted, in some of the Milan epigrams Posidippus seems to allude to precedents for literary patronage and thus to celebrate Arsinoe as patroness of the arts.³⁴ In the section on stones (*lithika*), the seal chosen by the Samian tyrant Polycrates is described as “the lyre of the singer who used to play at [your feet]” (9.1–2 AB: ἀνδρὸς ἀοιδοῦ/[τοῦ φο]ρμίζ[οντος σοῖς] παρὰ π[οσσ]ῖ λύρην). The archaic bard’s position at the tyrant’s feet, who is perhaps to be imagined as reclining at a symposium,³⁵ reflects the intimate and at the same time hierarchically determined relationship between poet and patron. It is, however, hard to imagine Posidippus envisaging for himself a similarly static relationship to the Ptolemies. Rather, he is to a certain extent an independent agent moving freely between the Alexandrian court and the Greek world, emphasizing the strong ties between Egypt and Macedonia by means of his diplomatic missions and his literary production. In status he may even have come close to the court officials Callicrates or Sostratus, for like them he was honored with inscriptions.³⁶ Callicrates therefore need not necessarily have acted as patron and intermediary between Posidippus and the rulers.³⁷ Rather, both in their respective functions cooperate in supporting the Ptolemaic vision.

2. *Kings, queens and nobility in further types of epigram*

The epigrams contained in the Milan Posidippus are organized in different sections according to their subject matter. Interestingly, there is no separate heading for epigrams dealing with the court, but instead

³⁴ In addition to 78 AB (above, n. 1), 9 AB probably refers to Anacreon, and 37 AB evokes the legend of the rescue by a dolphin of Arion, Periander’s court poet. Cf. Bertazzoli (2002); Bing (2002/3: 261–2) and (2005: 121, 127–31); Stephens (2004a: 173–4) and (2004b: 81); Gutzwiller (2005b: 314); Kuttner (2005: 154–6). In parallel to the Ptolemaic importance of Arion’s native Methymna on Lesbos, Iulis on Ceos in Callimachus 14 GP, besides being a Ptolemaic base (above, n. 23), is the birthplace of Simonides and Bacchylides (Gow-Page (1965: 2.170); cf. Bing (2002/3: 265, n. 43) and (2005: 131, n. 26)); Simonides also lurks behind the Scopadae in Posidippus 83 AB.

³⁵ Bastianini and Gallazzi (2001: 118), referring to Herodotus 3.121.

³⁶ *Test.* *2, 3 and *4 AB; cf. Bing (2002: 54–5, n. 19); Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 389–91); Gutzwiller (2005a: 4). On Callicrates see Bing (2002/3: 245–6).

³⁷ In this respect, I disagree with Lelli (2005), who seems to overstate the difference in socio-cultural status between Callimachus and Posidippus and their respective audiences, identifying Callicrates as the latter’s patron and sponsor at the court. More to the point, Stephens (2005) views the divergences between the two court poets in terms of a poetic competition.

Ptolemaic themes are reflected in almost every one of the subsections, most notably in the *anathematika* and the *hippika*. This fact suggests that epigrams associated with the court do not constitute a distinct category, but rather form a pervasive mode that may be extended to any type of epigram.

In the preceding section, I have argued that the dedicatory epigrams connected to the temple of Arsinoë Aphrodite on Cape Zephyrium can be interpreted as a means of communication between the Ptolemies and their subjects. The epinician epigrams advertising the victories of the Ptolemaic kings and queens in the pan-Hellenic games occupy a parallel function in legitimizing and praising the Ptolemaic dynasty in front of the whole Greek world. Recent studies have shown how the arrangement of epigrams in the *hippika*-section of the Milan Posidippus emphasizes family ties in a manner parallel to other forms of Ptolemaic self-representation, like dynastic group monuments.³⁸ Correspondingly, some of Posidippus' *hippika* that present themselves as inscriptions on statues of the winning horses employ narrative techniques derived from dedicatory as well as ecphrastic epigram.³⁹ Thus, in 87 AB Berenice's mares announce the queen's Olympic victory in their own voice, alluding to their metamorphosis from racing horses into statues, and the same queen (Berenice I) or her younger namesake (Berenice II) is celebrated in two ecphrastic epigrams.⁴⁰ While an epigram by Callimachus (15 GP = *AP* 5.146 = 51 Pf.) elegantly characterizes Berenice as the fourth Grace, a distich ascribed to either Asclepiades (39 GP = *AP* 1.68) or Posidippus (*141 AB) associates a statue of the queen with Aphrodite:⁴¹

Κύπριδος ἅδ' εἰκὼν· φέρ' ἰδόμεθα μὴ Βερενίκας·
διστάζω ποτέραι φῆι τις ὁμοιοτέραν.

³⁸ See Fantuzzi (2004a) and (2005); cf. Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 377–403); Kosmetatou (2004b) on the Ptolemaic *Familiengruppe*.

³⁹ On the interaction between the visual and the literary in the *hippika* see Papalexandrou (2004: 250–5); cf. Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 393).

⁴⁰ On ecphrastic epigrams in praise of monarchs see Gutzwiller (2002a: 91–4). Posidippus' *andriantopoika* (62–70 AB) focus programmatically on statues of Alexander (cf. Gutzwiller (2002b); Kosmetatou (2004c); Esposito (2005)). See also Männlein-Robert in this volume.

⁴¹ On Callimachus 15 GP see now Petrovic and Petrovic (2003), who interpret it as an introductory epigram to *Aetia* 3 and 4 and accordingly identify the queen with Berenice II, whereas the queen in the epigram by Asclepiades or Posidippus is more often identified with Berenice I.

This is a statue of Cypris. But let us see if it is not Berenice's.

I am at a loss. Which of the two should one say it resembles more?

By questioning the identity of the statue, the epigram points to the life-likeness of the work of art (ὁμοιοτέραν); moreover, it calls attention to Berenice's interchangeable *personae* of queen and deity by subtly reversing the erotic *topos* of comparing a beautiful woman to the statue of a goddess.⁴² Although the epigram does not give a context, the reader seems to be invited to construe a scene of women visiting a temple and gazing at the statue exhibited there, for the speaker, either a woman or a man impersonating a specifically female ecphrastic voice, presents herself as an imaginary viewer who calls upon others to join her (φέρ' ἰδόμεθα), as in Euripides' *Ion* (184–237), in Herondas' fourth *Mimiamb* and most pertinently in an epigram by Nossis describing a statue of Aphrodite (4.1–2 GP = AP 9.332.1–2: Ἐλθοῖσαι ποτὶ ναὸν ἰδόμεθα τᾶς Ἀφροδίτας/τὸ βρέτας).⁴³ Likewise, in Theocritus' *Idyll* 15, two Alexandrian women attend the festivities of the Adonia organized by Arsinoe, making use of the special occasion to visit a part of the palace normally closed to the public (esp. 22–6, 78–86).⁴⁴ Rather than reading the texts as ironic portrayals of the Alexandrian bourgeoisie destined exclusively for the amusement of a court audience, I would assign them a function in the system of communication between the Ptolemies and their citizens. For readers who do not have access to the palace or the temples, the poems act as substitutes, allowing them a

⁴² Cf. the examples in Petrovic and Petrovic (2003: 190–1). Annette Harder refers me to Odysseus meeting Nausicaa in *Odyssey* 6, who addresses her first as a goddess and then as a mortal woman (148ff.; cf. 119ff.).

⁴³ For the gendered ecphrastic voice developed by women epigrammatists and its appropriation by male poets see Skinner (2001); Murray and Rowland in this volume. Gutzwiller (2002a: 93), comparing Nossis 9 GP (= AP 6.345), and Sens (2002b: 260), although accepting ἰδόμεθα as a specific allusion to Nossis 4 GP, apparently characterize the speaker of the epigram in question as male; likewise Zanker (2004: 114–5, 141–2).

⁴⁴ Weber (1997: 62) defines the opening of the palace as a form of ostentation to bestow prestige upon the rulers. On the Ptolemaic context of the Adonia see Reed (2000) and Stephens (2003: 167–8, 246–8). Further evidence for widespread interest in court matters may be seen in the fact that an epigram recording the dedication at the royal palace of a nymphaeum adorned with a statue of Arsinoe (Posidippus *113 AB = Anonymous 151a *FGE* = *SH* 978) is preserved in a contemporary schoolbook from the late third century B.C. (PCair. 6544: cf. Thompson (1987: 113) and (2005: 281); Wißmann (2002: 222–6)); von Hesberg (1981: 96–107) interprets the detailed description as a didactic and at the same time distancing device that reflects the limited accessibility of the royal premises to the public. See also Bing (2005) and Kuttner (2005) on Posidippus' *lithika* as reflections of royal and élite displays.

privileged glance and guiding them how to interpret the new cults.

Funerary epigrams make up the last major category of epigram to be considered in this context.⁴⁵ In contrast to the host of dedicatory, epinician and ecphrastic epigrams referring to the Ptolemies, there are very few funerary epigrams that seem to have been composed specifically for members of the royal family. The reason for this may be that in Ptolemaic ideology the emphasis lies not upon death, but upon deification and dynastic cult, topics that call for panegyric rather than mourning.⁴⁶ Moreover, in this case epigram may indeed be too small a form to commemorate the death of kings or queens.⁴⁷ Instead, Callimachus composed a longer lyrical poem on the death and apotheosis of Arsinoe, the *Ektheosis Arsinoes* (fr. 228 Pf.). In his poetic imagination, the grief for the departed queen exceeds all measure so as to encompass the whole land of Egypt and even to reach heaven; the goddess Charis interprets the clouds of smoke and the laments as a sign that no ordinary citizen is being mourned, but one of the “great ones” (71–2: οὐχ ὥς ἐπὶ δαμοτ[έρων]... ἀλλὰ τι τῶ[ν] μεγάλων). The contrast may also imply that a more elevated style or genre is called for upon this occasion.⁴⁸

Accordingly, funerary epigram seems to have been the province of nobility rather than royalty. Without entering the rather unfruitful discussion whether or not the epigrams that name specific individuals and cities were intended to be inscribed on actual tombs, at least some of them may have been composed for prominent citizens acquainted with the poets.⁴⁹ For instance, Callimachus’ epitaph on Critias, the son of

⁴⁵ For the present purpose, I leave aside erotic and sympotic epigram, although the former category features some mistresses of Ptolemy Philadelphus (cf. Cameron (1995: 233–46); Kosmetatou (2004a)), while the latter type may be connected to symposia at the court (cf. Cameron (1995: 71–103)).

⁴⁶ Luppe (2003) interprets a damaged passage in Posidippus 37.5–6 AB as a reference to the nightingales’ song mourning the deceased Arsinoe, whose deification is however presupposed by the votive offering to her temple.

⁴⁷ On length as a potential distinction for epigrams or elegies celebrating royalty, see Parsons (2002: 125, 130); Hutchinson (2002a: 5, 8); Fantuzzi (2004a: 219); Stephens (2004b: 71–81).

⁴⁸ The hyperbolic imagery of cosmic mourning is taken up in Antipater of Sidon 25 GP (= *AP* 7.241) commemorating the premature death of Ptolemy Philometor’s son Eupator (Gow-Page (1965: 2.54–5)). Perhaps epigram is a genre suitable for a very young prince. However, as Annette Harder reminds me, also in the case of the *Victoria Berenices* Callimachus chose the longer form over against the epinician epigrams by Posidippus.

⁴⁹ On the complex relationship between “inscribed” and “quasi-inscriptional” epigram see the general remarks by Bing (1998: 29–40); similarly Ambühl (2002:

Hippacus and Didyme from Cyzicus, defines the family as a prominent one (43.2 GP = AP 7.521.2 = 12.2 Pf.: ἀφανῆς οὔτι γὰρ ἡ γενεή). But again, what I am interested in here is not so much the identification of historical persons but the modes of self-representation reflected in the epigrams. As a working hypothesis, I suppose that epigrams composed for members of the nobility or even ordinary citizens take up themes associated with the Ptolemies and thus actively participate in the process of communication. On the one hand, these epigrams help propagate Ptolemaic values among a wider segment of the population; on the other, they apparently respond to the wish of members of higher social strata to enhance their prestige by obtaining individual compositions from poets who also write for the Ptolemies, and thereby to associate themselves with the court. Epigrams addressing Ptolemaic issues should therefore not be interpreted in the sense of a one-way communication in which court poets function only as mouthpieces for propaganda, but as a reciprocal process of exchange assigning the epigrammatists a crucial role as mediators between the court and the public.

In this sense, sepulchral epigrams in which the whole city mourns the deceased may mirror the theme of the empire mourning the queen on a smaller scale, for interestingly most of them are on young girls who died before marriage, presumably daughters of the local elite, and not on soldiers who died fighting for their city, as in 'Anacreon' 1 *FGE*. So, in Posidippus 50 AB, a "dark cloud went through the city" (1: κυάνεον νέφος ἦλθε δι' ἄστεος) at the funeral of the maiden Hedeia, as "the [whole] town joined in sympathetic grief" (5: συμπαθεῖς ἄλγ[ος] ἔην πάσῃ) πόλει).⁵⁰ On the other hand, funerary epigrams for women highlight the topics of marriage and children, not unexpectedly in view of the tradition.⁵¹ However, the emphasis upon strong conjugal ties based on mutual desire and upon legitimate childbirth also fits in well with the official image of the Ptolemaic queens.⁵² The key topics are

2–4), Meyer (2005: 130–43) and Obbink (2005). Recent pragmatic approaches to the funerary epigrams by Posidippus and Callimachus are to be found in Garulli (2005: 43–5) and Lelli (2005).

⁵⁰ Cf. Posidippus 44.2 AB (Pella); 51.2 AB (Karyai); 55.4 AB (Argos); Callimachus 32 GP = 20 Pf. (Cyrene; see below, p. 291). Bastianini and Gallazzi (2001: 170) quote parallels in inscribed epigrams from the second century B.C.

⁵¹ See Lattimore (1942: 275–6, 299–300); Pircher (1979: esp. 36–41, 64–8); Pomeroy (1984: esp. 72–3); Bastianini and Gallazzi (2001: 165–6); Bruss (2005b: 76–9); Garulli (2005: esp. 33–4); Gutzwiller (2005b: 293–9).

⁵² See Gutzwiller (1992b: 362–9) on the changes of emphasis in the public representation of the first three Ptolemaic queens.

echoed in Theocritus' *Idyll* 17, the Encomium on Ptolemy Philadelphus, which praises the likeness between parents and children that proves the genuine lineage (40–4, 63–4) as well as the mutual love between the royal spouses Ptolemy Soter and Berenice I (38–40) and Ptolemy Philadelphus and Arsinoe II (128–30).

There is certainly an element of reciprocity at work here, as the themes the Ptolemies have selected for special emphasis are also conventional in epitaph. In individual cases, it may therefore be hard to tell whether the source of the theme is generic, or whether it arises from royal interest. However, the collection comprised in the New Posidippus makes a crucial difference for reading these epigrams, as themes shared by the Ptolemies and their subjects are highlighted by repetition within a given section as well as by cross-references between different sections.⁵³ Thus, the sequence of funerary epigrams (42–61 AB) focuses on family relations, just as the royal family presents itself as an unbroken line of succeeding generations, stressing the bonds between children and parents and brothers and sisters, occasionally even by constructing fictional genealogies as in the case of Ptolemy III Euergetes and Berenice II.⁵⁴ Out of the nine epitaphs that treat peaceful death in old age, seven concern women (42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 58, 59 AB), the remaining two old men (60, 61 AB).⁵⁵ All of them mention children and sometimes even grandchildren and thus evoke a vivid picture of successive generations (47.2 AB: τέκνα τε καὶ τέκν[ω]ν εἰρομένας γενεάς; cf. 45.6, 59.3, 61.5–6 AB). Maybe not by coincidence, the epitaph that begins the section emphasizes the genuine lineage of the deceased woman's two sons (42.4 AB: γνήσιον ἀμφοτέρων αἶμα, ἀγαθὴ γενεή). Besides corresponding to aristocratic values in general, the pride in genealogy finds a close parallel in Ptolemaic dynastic ideology; so Callimachus' *Victoria Berenices* addresses Berenice II as νύμφα, κα[σιγνή]των ἱερὸν αἶμα θεῶν (*SH* 254.2: "bride, sacred blood of the Sibling Gods").⁵⁶ Within the collection of Posidippus' epigrams, the emphasis on royal lineage is most conspicuous in the *hippika*; moreover, like the sequence of epi-

⁵³ On the impact of the collection as a poetry book see especially Gutzwiller (2005b).

⁵⁴ Both were officially styled as children of Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II and thus as siblings, although Ptolemy's mother was Arsinoe I, while Berenice II was the daughter of Magas of Cyrene and Apame; cf. Weber (1993: 274–5).

⁵⁵ Cf. Callimachus' epitaph on an aged priestess (48 GP = AP 7.728 = 40 Pf.).

⁵⁶ The parallel is noted in Bastianini and Gallazzi (2001: 159).

taphs, the epigrams celebrating the victories of successive generations of Ptolemies put the accent on the female family members.

Corresponding to the ideal embodied by the Ptolemaic queens, some funerary epigrams put marital love between spouses at center stage. Thus, Protis in Posidippus 58 AB lived five loving decades with her husband and saw her daughters happily married, too, before she departed. In a similar vein, Theocritus 2 GP (= 13 Rossi = *AP* 6.340), a votive epigram, commemorates the dedication of a statue of Aphrodite Urania by Chrysogona, who shared her life and children with her husband Amphicles. Laura Rossi has put this epigram into the context of the cult of Arsinoe Aphrodite and interpreted it as “an example of the support, by a court poet, of the ideals promoted by the religious and political propaganda on marriage of the Ptolemaic court of Philadelphus.”⁵⁷ Although I basically agree with her interpretation, her definition of the epigram as a manifesto of royal propaganda seems to me too one-sided. Provided Chrysogona’s dedication is based on fact, why could it not have been Chrysogona’s own wish to enhance her and her husband’s status by associating herself with the ideals embodied by the royal spouses, thus actively cooperating with the poet?

A topic even more specifically associated with Ptolemaic ideology is sibling love (cf. Theocritus *Id.* 17.130: ἐκ θυμοῦ στέργοισα κασίγνητόν τε πόσιν τε—“loving her brother and husband with all her heart”). Considering the highly sensitive nature of sibling marriage for a Greek audience, it may be an unlikely topic for eliciting a broader response.⁵⁸ However, love between brothers and sisters also appears in a suggestive epigrammatic context that may reflect a Ptolemaic background. As I have argued elsewhere, Callimachus’ epigram 32 GP (= *AP* 7.517 = 20 Pf.) on the suicide of the Cyrenean maiden Basilo, who could not bear to live after the death of her brother Melanippus, subtly alludes to the Ptolemaic ideal of brother love embodied by Arsinoe Philadelphus.⁵⁹ In this case, too, a possibly real tragedy befalling a prominent family from Callimachus’ native city Cyrene has inspired a transfer of Ptolemaic

⁵⁷ Rossi (2001: 357; cf. 239–46). See also Bruss (2005b: 76–9) on Diotimus 5 GP (= *AP* 7.475), an epitaph on a wife who died from grief for her deceased husband.

⁵⁸ On the complex issue of Ptolemaic sibling-marriage see Carney (1987) and Ager (2005).

⁵⁹ Ambühl (2002). Bleisch (1996) sets Callimachus’ epigram 54 GP (= *AP* 7.89 = 1 Pf.) into the context of Ptolemaic sibling-marriage as well.

values.⁶⁰ Thus, Ptolemaic themes are not restricted to epigrams that explicitly celebrate kings and queens, but may also be reflected in epigrams that do not at first sight betray a court background.

3. *Epilogue: Hellenistic epigram in a Roman context*

Moving on from third-century Alexandria to the later epigrams contained in the *Garland* of Philip, the patronage of Greek epigrammatists in a predominantly Roman world shows both elements of continuity with as well as difference from Ptolemaic patronage but is in need of future research. At the beginning of the twentieth century, von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff had drawn a sharp distinction between Greek epigrams dating from the Hellenistic period and those from the early principate, claiming that it was only at Rome that epigram developed into court poetry.⁶¹ By contrasting his claim with the strongly Ptolemaic focus of the New Posidippus, we can measure how fundamentally the evaluation of Hellenistic epigram has been changed by the recent discoveries. The impact of the New Posidippus on subsequent poetry has only just begun to be studied.⁶² This might therefore be a chance to reassess the evaluation of the later Greek epigrammatists and their position in the tradition of epigram written for rulers. Instead of viewing them as inferior imitators and servile flatterers of the emperors, it will do them better justice to judge them according to the standards of their own cultural context and to acknowledge their importance as links between the Greek and the Roman epigrammatic tradition.

In the later Hellenistic period, epigrams continued to be written for Greek royalty. However, the changed power relations in the political world called for new forms of literary patronage. From the end of the second century B.C., Greek epigrammatists such as Antipater of Sidon,

⁶⁰ The names Melanippus, Aristippus and Basilo suggest an aristocratic or even royal background (see Gow-Page (1965: 2.190); cf. Ambühl (2002: 3, n. 8; 21, n. 97)). Callimachus' epigram is now mirrored by Posidippus 54 AB, a funerary epigram equally set in Cyrene where the ten-year-old Myrtis is bewailed and buried by her brothers while their father is traveling abroad, perhaps dying from grief upon his return (cf. Bastianini and Gallazzi (2001: 176); the last distich is unfortunately lost). On Greek sibling relationships see Bremmer (1997).

⁶¹ von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1924: 1.122).

⁶² Magnelli (2005) reviews the reception of the New Posidippus in Greek imperial poetry, Hutchinson (2002a) in Latin poetry.

Archias, Philodemus, Crinagoras, Antipater of Thessalonica and Philip, the editor of the *Garland*, to name only the most prominent ones, worked mainly for Roman patrons.⁶³ In accordance with the Roman conception of patronage as *amicitia*, in the late Republic Greek epigrammatists could enjoy quite a personal relationship with their patrician patrons, like Philodemus at the villa of L. Calpurnius Piso in Herculaneum.⁶⁴ In the early empire, patronage at the imperial court seems to have become the rule in line with the monopolizing tendency of the emperors. Nevertheless, like Ptolemaic patronage, Roman patronage need not automatically imply a huge gap between patron and poet with regard to social status, apart from the obvious asymmetry in political power. In this sense, Crinagoras of Mytilene, whose high standing is attested by inscriptions documenting his diplomatic career as an ambassador to Rome, appears as a true successor of Posidippus.

However, although the later epigrams continue panegyric themes and modes coined by their Ptolemaic predecessors, the Ptolemies have not simply been replaced by the Roman emperors, for the internal system of communication as reflected in the texts has changed significantly. On the one hand, the personal relationship between the poet and his patron is addressed more explicitly: the epigrammatists often speak in their own name, sending invitation letters or epigrams accompanying gifts as well as celebrating occasions from the private lives of their patrons and members of the imperial family.⁶⁵ On the other hand, the relationship between the poet and his immediate patron is superseded by the emperor. For instance, in Antipater of Thessalonica 40 GP *Garland* (= AP 10.25), the poet prays to Apollo for a safe voyage in the company of Piso, asking the god to secure the emperor's favor for Piso

⁶³ On the individual epigrammatists see Gow-Page (1965: 2.31–4) and (1968: 2.18–21, 210–3, 327–9, 371–4, 432–5). Cichorius (1922) is mainly concerned with questions of dating and prosopography. A literary study remains a desideratum; Laurens (1989: 119–27) sketches briefly the development of occasional epigram in the Roman period.

⁶⁴ On Philodemus and Piso see Sider (1997: 3–24; 152–60). On Roman patronage of Greek epigrammatists see also the remarks in Williams (1982: 8–10, 19–20), Wiseman (1982: 31–4) and Gold (1987: 73–86); cf. above n. 10. And see Magnelli in this volume.

⁶⁵ E.g., Philodemus 23 GP *Garland* (= 27 Sider = AP 11.44); Antipater 31, 45 GP *Garland* (= AP 9.93, 6.249); Crinagoras 3, 4, 7, 11 GP *Garland* (= AP 6.227, 229; 9.239, 545). On epistolary epigram see Rosenmeyer (2002: 139–43). Some of Posidippus' *lithika* may be poems to accompany presents (Parsons (2002: 123); Kuttner (2005)), though not in his own name.

as well as for his own songs. This triangular structure does not find an exact correspondence in Ptolemaic epigram, for there the poets do not define their place in the hierarchy of court officials and the Ptolemies.⁶⁶ Moreover, although the epigrams in the external world presumably continue to enhance the public prestige of the Roman patrons as well as the fame of the poet, they do not normally address a wider audience. Thus, in Rome a more exclusive internal communication system within the epigrams focusing on the poet, the patron and the emperor seems to have replaced the Ptolemaic model that mirrors the reception by a wider audience within the epigrams.⁶⁷

⁶⁶ Bingen (2002: 54) sets the role of Callicrates in parallel to that of Maecenas; but cf. above, p. 285.

⁶⁷ This article has invaluablely profited from the comments of both editors as well as from a memorable evening of discussion at the home of Prof. Stefan Radt near Groningen with him, Annette Harder, Ruurd Nauta, Jan Bremmer and Wytse Keulen.

EPINICIAN EPIGRAM

Adolf Köhnken

Epinician epigram was at first basically a short metrical inscription, as a rule in hexameters or elegiacs, normally dedicatory, highlighting the achievements of an athlete who had been successful in one or more competitions in the Panhellenic or at local games. As such, it is well documented in inscriptions since the seventh century B.C.¹ It is not, however, represented as a separate species or subspecies of epigrammatic poetry in the *GA*, which traces its roots ultimately to the *Garlands* of Meleager and Philip.² Such epigrams appear not to have been especially popular with individual literary epigrammatists of the Hellenistic age (with the significant exception of epigrammatic court poetry),³ except when used for peculiar and paradoxical variation or transformation. There are, in addition, striking examples of figurative usage of epinician themes.

In what follows I shall first consider a number of epinician epigrams found on stone (monumental inscriptions) commemorating victors in various athletic competitions to illustrate the traditional norm, the usual topics and typical layout. My second concern will be to examine the role of authentic or fictitious epinician inscriptions in the *GA* in general and the impact of epinician topics on Hellenistic epigrams down to the first century A.D. in particular. The purely literary among these, of course, by definition lack the backdrop of a monument.

Traditional inscriptional epigrams designed to commemorate a victory in one of the games will normally contain the name and home-city of the victor, the games and event in which he won,⁴ and,

¹ See, e.g., Ebert (1972).

² For the various poetic “garlands” and anthologies from Meleager to Planudes which have contributed to our *GA* see above all Cameron (1993: esp. 1–48 and 97–163); note also Gutzwiller (1998b: esp. 1–114).

³ See now, e.g., Posidippus 78, 79 and 82 AB on chariot and single horse victories of Ptolemaic kings and queens, Berenice II in particular; cp. Call., *Aet.* 3 *Prooemium*, fr. 254–69 *SH* (“Victoria Berenices”); see Parsons (2002: 99–136, esp. 124–5; 109 and 130) and below, n. 15.

⁴ See, e.g., the monodistichon ascribed to Simonides (*AP* 16.23) below.

in dedications, the god to whose favor the victory is attributed. In addition, there may be varying laudatory specifics. I quote a few examples from different periods (chosen at random and arranged according to places and events):

- (1) *CEG* 828 from Olympia, a bronze tablet with two elegiac distichs from the base of a lost statue, commemorates Troilus, winner in the chariot race (cp. also Paus. 6.1.4–5, who ascribes the statue to Lysippus). Its probable date is 368 B.C. (the victor is identified as an Elean by his official status):⁵

Ἑλλήνων ἦρχον τότε Ὀλυμπίαι ἡνίκα μοι Ζεὺς
 δῶκεν νικῆσαι πρῶτον Ὀλυμπιάδα
 ἵπποις ἀθλοφόροις, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον αὐτὶς ἐφεξῆς
 ἵπποις· υἱὸς δ' ἦν Τρωΐλος Ἀλκινόο.

I ruled over the Greeks [i.e., I was Hellanodicas] in Olympia at that time when Zeus first allowed me to win an Olympic victory with prize-winning horses; for the second time [sc. he allowed me to win] again with horses immediately afterwards: I was Troilus, son of Alcinous.

- (2) *CEG* 820 from Olympia on a fragment of a limestone base, according to Paus. 6.1.6 belonging to a chariot with charioteer and a “picture” (statue?) of the victorious Cynisca of Sparta, set alongside the statue of Troilus (see above), is dated to after 396 B.C. Below the metrical inscription which has Cynisca introducing herself (three hexameters, one pentameter), the name of the artist, Apelleas, is given in prose. The epigram has also been transmitted as *AP* 13.16, amongst the “Epigrams in Various Meters”:⁶

Σπάρτας μὲν βασιλῆες ἐμοὶ πατέρες καὶ ἀδελφοί,
 ἄρματι δ' ὠκυπόδων ἵππων νικῶσα Κυνίσκα
 εἰκόνα τάνδ' ἔστασα, μόναν δ' ἐμέ φαμι γυναικῶν
 Ἑλλάδος ἐκ πάσας τόνδε λαβεῖν στέφανον.

Kings of Sparta are related to me as fathers and brothers, but because I am victor with a chariot of swift horses I, Cynisca, have set here this likeness of mine, and it is my claim that I alone of women from all Greece have won this crown.

⁵ For the details, esp. “Hellanodicas,” Ebert (1972: 127–9).

⁶ For discussion see Ebert (1972: 110–3; facsimile 111); cp. Hansen (1989: 228–9); for the impact of the Cynisca epigram on Hellenistic epigrammatic court poetry see esp. Posidippus 87.3–4 AB and Parsons (2002: 111).

(3) *CEG* 855 from Delphi consists of five fragments from a limestone base in two parts. The first (originally placed above the other) contains a prose inscription with the (unmetrical) name of the victorious athlete (“Herogeiton, son of ?, of Magnesia”) and a list of his successes in the boys’ short-distance (stadion) and horse-distance runs⁷ at various games (the Pythia, Isthmia, Panathenaia, and Ephesia). The second, originally lower on the monument, contains an epigram of two elegiac distichs with the athlete introducing himself. The inscription is dated to the end of the fourth or beginning of the third century B.C.:⁸

Μάγνης μὲν γενεάν, στάδιον δέ με Πύθια παῖδας
νικῶντα ἔστεφάνωσε εἰκόνι τῇδε πόλις
Μαιάνδρου ρείθροις προσκειμένη, ἵπποτρόφος δὲ
Θεσσαλία πατρίδος μητρόπολις λέγεται.

I am a native of Magnesia, and because of my Pythian victory in the stadion at the boys’ competition my city which is located at the current of the Maeander crowned me with this picture. Horse-breeding Thessalia is called the mother-state (*metropolis*) of my father-city (*patris*).

I add two earlier specimens of other athletic events (*pankration* and boxing):

(4) *CEG* 362 (Nemea, limestone pillar, middle of the sixth century B.C.)⁹ is a dedicatory epigram in boustrophedon consisting of a monodistichon in commemoration of Aristis the pancratiast. *Extra metrum* additional patronymic information is given (father’s name and home-city). The speaker is the pillar:

Ἀριστίς με ἀνέθηκε Διὶ Κρονίωνι ἄνακτι
παγκράτιον νικῶν τετράκις ἐν Νεμέαι
Φεῖδωνος υἱὸς τοῦ Κλεωναίου.

Aristis dedicated me to Cronian Zeus the ruler because he was four times victor in the *pankration* at Nemea.

The son of Pheidon of Cleonae.

(5) *CEG* 383 (the white marble base of the statue of a youth; 460 or 450 B.C., Olympia) commemorates “Cyniscus, son of Cyniscus, the

⁷ For the term *hippios dromos* see Ebert (1972: 164, with n. 2).

⁸ For discussion see Ebert (1972: 163–5); cp. Hansen (1989: 258–9).

⁹ For details and discussion see Ebert (1972: 36–7), except that the closing patronymics are prose rather than iambs; see also Hansen (1983: *ad loc.*) for the literature (but Hansen’s “lapis calcarius” is rather non-committal). This epigram is the earliest evidence for the *pankration* at the Nemean Games (Ebert (1972: 36–7)).

boxer.” The epigram, a monodistichon, was inscribed on the upper side around the feet of the statue (cp. Paus. 6.4.11, according to whom Polyclitus was the sculptor):¹⁰

πύκτας τόνδ' ἀνέθηκεν ἅπ' εὐδόξοιο Κυνίσκος
Μαντινέας νικῶν πατρός ἔχων ὄνομα.

The boxer Cyniscus from renowned Mantinea dedicated this (statue) here because of his victory, he who has the name of his father.

All of these authentic inscriptional epigrams have in common their praise of a historical victor and connection to specific events and places. Such epinician epigrams may in effect be defined as *précis* of epinician odes stripped of narrative portions and argumentative elaboration to fit them into the severely limited space available on a monument or monument-base.¹¹ In addition, they all rely on their respective monuments and are incomplete or deficient without them (see, e.g., the Cyniscus epigram with its deictic reference to the unidentified monument and the place-name taken for granted).

Nevertheless, a number of such authentic inscriptions detached from their monuments have found their way into our epigram collections, sometimes ascribed to famous poets like Simonides or Anacreon or else labeled “anonymous” (e.g., the Cynisca epigram transmitted as *AP* 13.16). Even when there is no corroborating epigraphical evidence they are usually recognizable as authentic inscriptions because they refer to or presuppose a missing and unidentified monument. By comparison, literary epigrams proper need to identify any monument or object the reader is to visualize within the framework of the text itself.¹² Sometimes,

¹⁰ For further details see Ebert (1972: 82–4), and Hansen in *CEG ad loc.* (with literature). Cp., e.g., *CEG* 827 in honor of the boxer Philippus, dated to ca. 300 B.C., and belonging, according to Paus. 6.8.5, to a statue by Myron. This latter epigram is, however, much longer (three distichs), structurally more sophisticated (see esp. the elaborate distribution of the elements of the victor's name), and supplemented by a mythological reference to Polydeuces, the patron hero of boxers, cp. Ebert (1972: 168–9).

¹¹ Ebert (1972: 20): “Man könnte einige dieser Epigramme geradezu als kurze Epinikien bezeichnen.” He refers to his nr. 69 (pp. 203–8; Cleonymus of Rhodes, end of third century B.C.), but functionally more revealing are his nrr. 17 and 20 (= *CEG* 392) commemorating victories of Hieron of Syracuse and Ergoteles of Himera (1972: 71–3 and 79–82). The former, a dedicatory epigram of Deinomenes (preserved by Paus. 8.42.9) in honor of the Olympic racecourse exploits of his dead father can, to illustrate the point, be directly compared to Pindar's first Olympian.

¹² See already G.E. Lessing's observations and notes (1771) concerning the implications of this fact. See also Köhnken (1993: 119–21) and Bing's discussion of “Ergänzungsspiel,” that “process of supplementation... as a favored and self-conscious

however, there have been doubts about the provenience of epigrams transmitted only by the *GA*. I quote four examples, the first three ascribed to Simonides (all three are from *API* which preserves most of the epinicians proper found in the *GA*).

(1) *AP* 16.2 (= Simonides 30 *FGE*), two elegiac distichs and dated to the first half of the fifth century B.C., commemorates Theognetus (? name uncertain) for his Olympic victory in the boys' wrestling competition (cp. Paus. 6.9.1):

γῶθι Θεόγνητον† προσιδὼν τὸν Ὀλυμπιονίκαν
παῖδα, παλαισμοσύνης δεξιὸν ἡνίοχον,
κάλλιστον μὲν ἰδεῖν, ἀθλεῖν δ' οὐ χεῖρονα μορφῇς,
ὅς πατέρων ἀγαθῶν ἐστεφάνωσε πόλιν.

† Schneidewin Θεόκριτον *API* (unmetrical) cp. Paus. 6.9.1

Look at and recognize Theognetus, the boy, the Olympic victor, competent charioteer of the art of wrestling, extremely beautiful to look at and not inferior to his beautiful looks in actual fighting, who crowned his city of able ancestors.

None of the details supplied by Pausanias (the victor being from Aegina, his statue being a work of Ptoichus the Aeginetan, the statue carrying pinewood and pomegranate seed (?), both attributes inexplicable even for Pausanias) has any support in the epigram itself, and Wilamowitz for one found the absence of the home-city decidedly strange.¹³ It may well be that the victor has been wrongly identified with Pausanias' Theognetus. At any rate Wilamowitz rightly drew attention to the strikingly modern style of the epigram which rather points to Hellenistic epigrammatic practice, whereas parallels are difficult to find in pre-Hellenistic inscriptional epigrams (for the sophistication see below; contrast, e.g., the examples given above). The epigram is, moreover, complete in itself: the understanding does not depend on a monument now missing (there is no deictic reference of any kind to an object outside the actual epigram; contrast again the inscriptions quoted above). All the information needed is in the text, although it is oddly vague as judged by the

device" in Hellenistic poetry and above all in Callimachus (1995b: 115–31, esp. 116 and 122–4).

¹³ von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1922: 440, n. 1): "es bleibt anstößig, daß die Heimat nicht genannt ist und der ganze Ton erscheint weit moderner als man der Zeit zutrauen möchte." Ebert's arguments contra (1972: 58–9) are not convincing. Cp. also Page (1981: 244) who, drawing on von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, judges that "these lines may well be the work of a learned Alexandrian."

standards of an authentic epinician inscription. Little more than the name of the victor (Theognetus?) and his Olympic victory in the boys' wrestling competition are given. In place of the usual patronymic and home-city there is a rather nondescript generalization (4), and the reader is asked mainly to imagine a beautiful likeness of the athlete praised (1 and 3). The essential issue is highlighted in the antithetical line 3: the victor's striking beauty corresponds to the exceptional athletic prowess he displays in the act of wrestling (emphasized by chiasmic word-order). This also explains the pointed and at first sight strange juxtaposition of the imperative γνῶθι and the participle προσιδών in line 1: looking at the likeness of the boy (*prosidon*) one will gain an exact idea of the original (*gnothi*).

Joachim Ebert notes the surprising verbal and stylistic closeness of this epigram to Pindar's epinician poetry (see his detailed references, e.g., *Nem.* 6.66 and *Isthm.* 5.61 for line 2, *Ol.* 8.19 and *Ol.* 9.94 for line 3),¹⁴ but his conclusion that this proves an early date or even Pindaric provenance is hardly plausible. His observations rather fit in with the prominence of Pindar's *Epinicia* as favored reference texts (hypotexts) for Hellenistic poets, a fact richly documented in a number of recent studies.¹⁵

(2) *AP* 16.3 (= Simonides 42 *FGE*), a monodistichon praising Diophon, son of Philon, for victories in the pentathlon, is even more likely to be a purely literary Hellenistic product, although it is listed as an authentic inscription of perhaps the fifth century B.C. by, e.g., Ebert (who has, however, misgivings).¹⁶

Ἴσθμια καὶ Πυθοῖ Διοφῶν ὁ Φίλωνος ἐνικά
ἄλμα, ποδωκείην, δίσκον, ἄκοντα, πάλην.

¹⁴ Ebert (1972: 58–9).

¹⁵ See esp. Fuhrer (1992) on the influence of Pindar's epinician *Odes* on the epinicia of Callimachus: see, e.g., the summary 217–25; cp. 100–3 and 219–20 on “Gemeinsamkeiten mit dem Epigramm.” In “Anhang VI” (243–4), she prints “vier agonistische Epigramme aus hellenistischer Zeit,” nrr. 59, 64, 69, 72 in Ebert (1972). None of them are found in the *GA*.

¹⁶ Ebert (1972: 181–2). But see his reservations (181): “Aber insgesamt kann man sich des Eindrucks einer späten Spielerei nicht ganz erwehren, und es ist sehr fraglich, ob das Epigramm überhaupt je auf Stein gestanden hat”. Cp. Page (1981: 260–2) who, after a lengthy discussion of the difficulties inherent in assuming “an authentic inscription,” concludes that “this epigram is not an inscriptional record; it must be a literary exercise, with its point in the neat pentameter.”

At the Isthmia and in Pytho Diophon, son of Philon, was victorious in long jump, quickness of feet, discus, javelin, wrestling.

No home-city is mentioned, no monument implied, no place given for which this epigram might have been designed. In addition, epinician dedication and patron deity are missing. Nevertheless these “deficiencies” are not felt unless authentic epinician inscriptions are compared. Taken as a literary epideictic poem the epigram is again complete by itself.

Artistically, moreover, this monodistichon is a remarkable achievement, compressing the five events of the pentathlon into just the pentameter, itself ringing with assonance (note the beginning of the first and that of the last word; and the homericizing ποδωκείην before the diaeresis which replaces the *terminus technicus* “*stadion*” not only for metrical reasons but also to allow a homoeoteleuton with the final πάλην). In addition, the name and patronymic of the victor (Διοφῶν ὁ Φίλωνος), again conspicuous for assonance, are placed in the center of the hexameter enclosed by details of the victory arranged in hyperbaton. Taken as a whole the epigram is a model of Hellenistic epigrammatic “brachylogy.”¹⁷

(3) *AP* 16.23 (= Simonides 31 *FGE*), a monodistichon in dialogue form, commemorates Casmylus, the Rhodian boxer, for a Pythian victory. It is also listed by Ebert who does not exclude that it may be an authentic inscription of the fifth century B.C. (see below), but admits that it looks suspiciously Hellenistic:¹⁸

—εἶπον τίς, τίνος ἐσσί, τίνος πατρίδος, τί δ' ἐνίκης.
—Κασμύλος, Εὐαγόρου, Πύθια πύξ, Ῥόδιος.

“Tell me who and whose son you are, from which city, and what you won.”—“Casmylus, son of Euagoras, boxing in the Pythian Games, from Rhodes.”

Casmylus the Rhodian boxing champion was praised by Pindar for an Isthmian victory in a lost Isthmian ode (fr. 2 Sn.) which seems also to have referred to his earlier Pythian success (cp. Ebert and Page; see above). Scholars do not agree on whether the epigram might or might

¹⁷ See, e.g., Callimachus 58.1–2, 6 GP (= 8 Pf.). Discussion below. Cp. Ferguson (1970: 75); Lausberg (1982: 37–44) comments on Parmenion 11 GP *Garland* (= *AP* 9.342) and other “programmatic epigrams.”

¹⁸ (1972: 185–6).

not be an authentic fifth-century inscription. Ebert, for example, thinks it may be,¹⁹ and indeed, there is an example from the fifth century (*CEG* 429), although he seems to have overlooked it in asserting that there is no evidence for a comparable dialogue in inscriptions before the third century B.C. Moreover, the epigram not only does not suggest a monument or indicate a specific context,²⁰ but it even fails to disclose whether it is supposed to be dedicatory or sepulchral. Obviously, this was irrelevant for the composer. His purpose rather seems to be to concentrate all the information about the victor conventionally requested in as few words as possible. The hexameter poses the questions (in polyptoton: τίς...τίνος...τίνος...τί...); the pentameter gives the exceptionally laconic answer (Κασμύλος at the beginning and Ῥόδιος at the end enclosing the emphatic paronomasia Πύθια πύξ). Clearly, the Casmylus monodistichon is a Hellenistic play with epinician essentials, and it looks as if the epigrammatist has made use of the famous Rhodian boxer praised by Pindar to give his pointed epinician a prominent subject.

(4) *AP* 6.135 (= Anacreon 6 *FGE*), a monodistichon on a statue of the victorious horse of Pheidolas of Corinth dedicated to Zeus (according to Pausanias 6.13.9, the name of the horse was Aura, but Pausanias seems to refer to, but does not quote, the epigram in connection with a second monodistichon commissioned by the sons of Pheidolas, which he quotes, commemorating the victories of another horse, named Lycus):²¹

οὔτος Φειδόλα ἵππος ἀπ' εὐρυχόροιο Κορίνθου
ἄγκειται Κρονίδα, μνᾶμα ποδῶν ἀρετᾶς.

¹⁹ As does, e.g., Lausberg (1982: 178), but the question is not so much whether the epigram is a fifth century or Hellenistic "inscription," but whether it is inscriptional at all (see Ebert 1972: 186 and 181, quoted above, n. 16). See also Page (1981: 245): "The alternative, that it is a product of Alexandrian ingenuity, is not less probable, perhaps the likelier in view of the dialogue-form."

²⁰ Contrast, e.g., the authentic inscriptional epinician epigram Hiller von Gaertringen 119 (1926: 51) in honor of P. Cornelius Ariston, Olympic victor in the *pankration* (*A.D.* 49), partly cited in Robert (1968: 196), a comparable dialogue but four times as long as the Casmylus epigram.

²¹ On Pausanias' statement of the horse's name, see Page (1981: 402). Both epigrams are available in Friedländer (1948: 97 and 143) (nrr. 97 and 151) and Ebert (1972: 46–9) (nrr. 6 and 7). For the difficulties inherent in Pausanias' anecdotal report as compared to the text of our epigram see Page's app. crit. The interpretation has been marred by unjustified attempts to alter the deictic pronoun at the beginning of the hexameter, for which see, e.g., Ebert.

This horse of Pheidolas from wide-spaced Corinth is a dedication to the son of Cronus in memory of the excellence of its feet [or perhaps rather: "This is the horse of Pheidolas...It is a dedication...", in asyndeton].

This epinician has clearly found its place in book 6 of the *GA*, "Anathematic Epigrams," because of its curious deviation from the conventions of the genre. Instead of the victorious owner, Pheidolas, proclaiming the victory of his horse, the victorious horse is separated from its owner and by itself acclaimed for its superior swiftness.²²

Nevertheless, the monodistichon is probably an authentic inscription as is suggested not so much by the introductory οὗτος, referring to the monument of the horse the reader is supposed to have before his eyes,²³ as by the indirect and slightly deficient presentation of the horse (which lacks a name) and its victorious owner Pheidolas (no patronymic given:²⁴ the epigram may originally have been accompanied by a prose-tag; see, e.g., the Aristis epigram quoted above).²⁵

Obviously fictitious, however, and at the same time characteristically Alexandrian are the following epinician epigrams from the *GA* which are much more spectacular deviations from the norms of the authentic epinician inscription. They show Hellenistic poets experimenting with and exploring the possibilities of the epinician genre and may be divided into six different categories.

(1) the mythological epinician epigram:

AP 6.49 (anonymous; cp. *Athen.* 6.232d) is comprised of four hexameters introducing a bronze tripod alleged to have been dedicated by Diomedes in Delphi for his victory in the chariot race at the funeral

²² This unusual presentation may have given rise to the anecdote recorded in Pausanias that the horse had thrown off its rider and successfully finished the race by itself (see above; but cp. Page (1981: 402)).

²³ Cp. the very similar beginning of the fragmentary inscriptional epigram *CEG* 803 (εἰκόνες αἰδ' ἵππων) from Delphi, also in Ebert (1972: 136–7), dated to the middle of the fourth century.

²⁴ Contrast Posidippus 71 AB which also begins with a οὗτος referring to the statue of a victorious horse, but in this case the horse has a name (Aethon), and its owner (Hippostratus, the speaker of the epigram; no patronymic, but Thessalia honored as home-country) has himself and his horse explicitly proclaimed victors. Moreover, the suspiciously significant name and the pointed linking of horse and master (both winning "races" at the same Pythiad, see the second line's ambivalent *terminus technicus* "stadion," and line 3, δις δ' ἀνεκκρήχθην), which accounts for the lack of a patronymic, argue against an authentic inscription.

²⁵ See also Page (1975: *ad loc.*): "vetus videtur epigr., nam Pheidolae victoriam posteris esse curae vix credibile."

games in honor of Patroclus (*Il.* 23.262–652: for the tripod see 23.264 and 513). The speaker is the tripod:

Χάλκεός εἰμι τρίπους, Πυθοῖ δ' ἀνάκειμαι ἄγαλμα,
καὶ μ' ἐπὶ Πατρόκλῳ θῆκεν πόδας ὥκυν Ἀχιλλεύς.
Τυδείδης δ' ἀνέθηκε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης,
νικήσας ἵπποισιν ἐπὶ πλατὺν Ἑλλήσποντον.

A bronze tripod am I, in Pytho I stand as a glorious gift; swift-footed Achilles had offered me as a prize in honor of Patroclus. The son of Tydeus, the brave fighter Diomedes, dedicated me having won with his horses (in the race) to broad Hellespont.

The outcome of the narrative of the chariot race in *Iliad* 23 is here turned into a dedicatory epinician epigram in Homeric style which is remarkable for its surplus information (no detail concerning the object dedicated is left unexplained) and its combination of technical terms from the traditional victory inscription (see 1: Πυθοῖ δ' ἀνάκειμαι ἄγαλμα; and 3–4: ἀνέθηκε... νικήσας ἵπποισιν) with the language of the Homeric narrative (see in 2 and 3 the familiar *epitheta constantia*; 2 has θῆκεν in the sense of “offer as a prize,” cp. *Il.* 23.263; and 4 closes with the phrase ἐπὶ πλατὺν Ἑλλήσποντον,²⁶ quoting *Il.* 17.432, ἐπὶ νῆας ἐπὶ πλατὺν Ἑλλήσποντον, a variant to *Il.* 23.374, ἄψ ἐφ' ἄλδος πολιῆς, “back to the seashore (of the Hellespont),” i.e., the finish-line of the race-course). The epic coloring is further strengthened by the exclusive use of hexameters. The reader might ask why the tripod is dedicated in Delphi. Diomedes is the winner of the Homeric chariot-race by a large margin but only because of Athena's help and in spite of Apollo's wrath, which had nearly cost him his victory (*Il.* 23.382–400). That the epigram makes him nevertheless dedicate his victory prize to Pythian Apollo implies a wish to propitiate the god. Familiarity with the details of the hypotext is evidently taken for granted, and the epigram is an amusing Hellenistic exercise in literary allusion dressed up as a traditional epinician epigram.²⁷

²⁶ The *varia lectio* παρὰ πλατὺν Ἑλλήσποντον in Plutarch 6.232d does not agree with the *Iliad* narrative.

²⁷ It belongs with the numerous epigrams in the *GA* using Homer as a hypotext (cp. the sepulchral epigrams *AP* 7.142–52, which include the Ajax epigram of Asclepiades (145 = 29 GP) and the variations by Mnasalces (17 GP = Ath. 4.163A) and Antipater of Sidon (146 = 7 GP); see von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1924: 1.116–7)), but seems to be the only epinician and dedicatory variant.

(2) the epinician dialogue epigram:

Philip 23 GP *Garland* (= *AP* 6.259) is a dialogue in three elegiac distichs featuring a passer-by and a Hermes statue alleged to be set up at the starting line of the boys' short-distance race course:²⁸

—τίς τὸν ἄχουν Ἑρμῆν σε παρ' ὑσπλήγεσσιν ἔθηκεν;
 —Ἑρμογένης.—τίνος ὢν;—Δαΐμένευσ.—ποδαπός;
 —Ἀντιοχεύς.—τιμῶν σε χάριν τίνος;—ὥς συναρωγὸν
 ἐν σταδίοις.—ποίοις;—Ἰσθμόθι κῆν Νεμέα.
 —ἔτρεχε γάρ;—καὶ πρῶτος.—ἐλὼν τίνας;—ἐννέα παῖδας.
 ἔπειθ' ὃς ἂν ἔχων τοὺς πόδας ἡμετέρους.

“Who dedicated you, the beardless Hermes, at the starting posts?”—
 “Hermogenes.”—“Whose son?”—“Daimenes’.”—“Where from?”—
 “Antioch.”—“Honoring you for what reason?”—“For my help in the
 short distance courses.”—“In which ones?”—“At the Isthmus and in
 Nemea.”—“So he was a runner?”—“Yes, he was first.”—“Defeating
 whom?”—“Nine boys; he flew as if possessing my feet.”

The epigram is complete in itself; there is no external reference. All the details required to visualize the Hermes statue are given in the text. The technique of the epigrammatic dialogue—of which Callimachus' monodistichon (22 GP = 34 Pf.) is perhaps the most spectacular example²⁹—is here given an epinician twist. The point the epigram leads up to is the winged feet of Hermes which are part of the answer to a question already asked in line 3, but for emphasis pushed back to the final line. “Hermes' feet” illustrate to great effect the unsurpassed swiftness of the runner and give the ultimate reason for the imagined dedication and the peculiar and surprising position of the object dedicated (cp. line 1). Finally, to clinch the matter, the name of the victorious athlete, Hermogenes, is clearly chosen for its etymological connection with that of his patron god, Hermes.

²⁸ Gow-Page (1968: 2.346) have very little to say about this epigram, except to point out a comparison with Philoxenus *AP* 9.319 for a Hermes set up at the starting apparatus of a racecourse. The beardlessness of the Hermes is, *pace* Gow-Page, certainly emphasized because the subject is the boys' running competition.

²⁹ Cp., e.g., Callimachus 51 GP (another monodistichon); 31 GP (three distichs); Posidippus 19 GP (= 142 AB, six distichs, on which see the comments of Gutzwiller (2002a: 95–6); cp. Hopkinson (1988: 269–70)); Antipater of Sidon 21 GP (five distichs); and Meleager 130 GP (four distichs). On Callimachus 22 GP see Köhnken (1993: 121–3); cp. Meyer (2005: 214–5), whose comment, “diese ansonsten unübliche Dialogisierung des Weihepigramms,” (215) is, however, slightly misleading. Compare the Hermogenes epigram quoted above.

(3) the paradoxical epinician epigram:

Antipater of Thessalonica 79 GP *Garland* (= AP 9.557), three elegiac distichs, again takes up the theme of the exceptional swiftness of a short-distance runner in the boys' age group:

ὁ σταδιεὺς Ἀρίης ὁ Μενεκλέος οὐ κατελέγχει
 Περσέα, σὸν κτίστην, Ταρσέ, Κίλισσα πόλι.
 τοῖοι γὰρ παιδὸς πτηνοὶ πόδες, οὐδ' ἄν ἐκείνῳ
 οὐδ' αὐτὸς Περσεὺς νῶτον ἔδειξε θέων.
 ἦ γὰρ ἐφ' ὑσπλήγων ἢ τέρματος εἶδέ τις ἄκρου
 ἦθεον, μέσσω δ' οὔποτε' ἐνὶ σταδίῳ.

Aries the *stadion*-runner, son of Meneclēs, does not disgrace Perseus, your founder, Tarsus, Cilician city. For of such a quality are the boy's winged feet; and not even Perseus himself would have shown him his back when running. For one saw the boy either at the starting line or at the finishing post, but never in the middle of the course.

Most of the information traditionally required is given (name and patronymic of the victor, home-city, age-group, and event in which he competed), but the epigram is nevertheless far from being an authentic inscription. Specifics of the games in which Aries may have been victorious, or of a place for a monument commemorating his victory, are not only lacking but not even intended. The epigram is again in itself complete. In spite of the reference to Perseus, founding hero of Tarsus in Cilicia, Aries' home city, the epigram does not resemble a straightforward encomium either. Tarsus, the addressee of the epigram, rather seems to have been selected because the name suggests "foot" (ταρσός) and thus supplies a link between the boy victor's home city and his and its founding hero Perseus' essential quality, "winged feet" (3, πτηνοὶ πόδες).³⁰ This quality provides the basis for the extreme final paradox (5–6), which is the point of this fictitious epinician. When competing, the boy is visible only at the starting line and finish line, never in between: the swiftness of this runner is such that nobody has ever seen him actually running.³¹

³⁰ Cp. *Carm. Anacr.* 37.4–5 West: ... ἐδόκουν ἄκροισι ταρσῶν δρόμον ὠκὺν ἐκτανύειν...; cp. Posidippus 19.3–4 GP (= 142 AB).

³¹ The note of Gow-Page (1968: 2.82), "The meaning is that Aries ran so fast that he was invisible until he came to a stop," is correct as far as it goes but does not really face the paradox (see also their title for the poem (1968: 1.61), "Praise of a young sprinter"). Their comment (2.81) that Lucilius AP 11.163 "perhaps borrows" Meneclēs, the name of Aries' father, for his "visibly fictitious *stadieus*" seems to imply that they do not regard our epigram as "visibly fictitious."

(4) the anti-climactic epinician epigram:

Archias 19 GP *Garland* (= *AP* 9.19) consists of five elegiac distichs on an old racehorse once a champion:

ὁ πρὶν ἀελλοπόδων λάμπας πλέον Αἰετὸς ἵππων,
 ὁ πρὶν ὑπαὶ μίτραις κῶλα καθαψάμενος,
 ὃν Φοίβου χρησμοδὸς ἀέθλιον ἔστεφε Πυθῶ
 ὀρνύμενον παανοῖς ὠκυπέταις ἵκελον,
 καὶ Νεμέῃ βλοσυροῖο τιθηνήτειρα λέοντος
 Πίσά τε καὶ δοιάς ἡϊόνας Ἴσθμὸς ἔχων,
 νῦν κλοιῷ δειρὴν πεπεδημένος οἷα χαλινῷ
 καρπὸν ἀλεῖ Διοῦς ὀκρίονεντι λίθῳ,
 ἴσαν μοῖραν ἔχων Ἡρακλεί· καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος
 τόσσ' ἀνύσας δούλαν ζευγλαν ἐφηρμόσατο.

Aeetus (“Eagle”), who *once* stood out in brilliance among wind-swift horses, who *once* had its limbs bound with garlands, whom Pytho, oracular prophetess of Phoebus, used to crown as a victorious champion, because it stormed along similar to swift-winged birds, and Nemea, nurse of the shaggy lion, and Pisa, and the Isthmus with its two beaches: *now*, its neck bound by a collar like a bridle grinds the fruit of Demeter with a sharp-edged stone, enduring a fate equal to that of Hercules, for he, too, in spite of all his exploits had to adapt to the yoke of slavery.

The epinician epigram so shifts the priorities of the genre as to achieve an anticlimax. Instead of praising Aeetus, the victorious racehorse, at the height of his career, it deplors his fate in his quasi-retirement, an ironic and devastating change of perspective. The epigram consists of three parts, the first two structured around the temporal indicators “once” (πρὶν; in 1–6 Aeetus used to be consistently victorious in all four panhellenic games, a *periodonikes*) and “now” (νῦν; in 7–8 Aeetus is treated like a slave); the third and final one, a surprising and amusing mythological allusion to Hercules (9–10). The bold comparison extends the fate of the once victorious racehorse to that of the best of men and thus gives the outcome of the epinician a striking general point: even the great Hercules in spite of his innumerable accomplishments ended up as a servant (to queen Omphale, her name to be supplied by the reader).³²

³² The epigram, which has close parallels in *AP* 9.20 and 21, is severely criticized, without being analyzed, in Gow-Page (1968: 2.443): “The whole is verbose and lacking in the customary cleverness.” Their judgment that it is “much the inferior” to *AP* 9.20, an anonymous epigram on an anonymous horse, is open to doubts. A further parallel of the “once”—“now” type is Mnasalces 11 GP (= *AP* 7.212), which contrasts the tomb of “swift Aethyia” with the time when it was an indefatigable long distance

(5) the mock epinician epigram:

In Callimachus 25 GP (= *AP* 6.149 = 56 Pf.), two elegiac distichs allegedly inscribed on a bronze statue of a victorious fighting cock, it is the cock who speaks:

Φησὶν ὃ με στήσας Εὐαίνετος—οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε
 γινώσκω—νίκης ἀντί με τῆς ιδίης
 ἀγκεῖσθαι χάλκειον ἀλέκτορα Τυνδαρίδῃσι.
 πιστεύω Φαίδρου παιδὶ Φιλοξενίδεω.

According to Euaenetus, who set me up (for I myself don't know), I have been dedicated for my own victory, a bronze cock to the Tyndarids: I believe the son of Phaedrus, the son of Philoxenus.

This epigram, formally consisting of a reported inscription (1–3) and a comment on it (4), is remarkable not so much for the unusual object of the dedication, exchanging as it does the statues of victorious athletes or racehorses for that of a fictitious fighting cock, but for the avowal of the bronze cock that it is unable to fulfill the objective for which it has been dedicated. Its testament to its own victory is impossible, because the likeness cannot logically have any knowledge about the accomplishments of the original. It can only believe the words of its dedicator Euaenetus. This pointed confession replacing knowledge by belief mocks the very purpose of the authentic epinician monument and inscription. The epigram playfully questions the conventions of the genre.³³

This Callimachean example can serve as a transition to the satirical epigrams of Lucillius on athletes which turn the epinician genre on its head.

(6) the satirical parody-epinician epigram:

Lucillius *AP* 11.84 is made up of three elegiac distichs on the “achievements” of a pentathlete:

racehorse. Seen in a wider context, these epigrams are epinician variants of the “(youthful) fame—(old-age) decline” contrast, for which see esp. books 6 and 7 of the *GA* (e.g., the epigrams on Lais, *AP* 6.1 (= “Plato” 8 *FGE*; comments in Page (1981: 166–7)) and 18–20; Antipater of Sidon *AP* 7.218 (= 33 GP); and Anonymous 130 *FGE* with comments in Page (1981: 439–40), hardly “an authentic inscription” on the once beautiful hetaera in old age or dead).

³³ For the details see Köhnken (1993: 128–9); also Gutzwiller (1998b: 193); and esp. Meyer (2005: 196–9), who refers above all to Lucillius *AP* 11.312, a striking modification of Callimachus’ Euaenetus epigram. For other varieties of the epigrammatic mock epinician, see, e.g., Asclepiades 27 GP and Callimachus 27 GP, with Meyer (2005: 182–3, cp. 155 and 195).

Οὔτε τάχιον ἐμοῦ τις ἐν ἀντιπάλοισιν ἔπιπτεν,
οὔτε βράδιον ὅλως ἔδραμε τὸ στάδιον·
δίσκῳ μὲν γάρ ὅλως οὐδ' ἤγγισα, τοὺς δὲ πόδας μου
ἐξάραι πηδῶν ἴσχυον οὐδέποτε·
κυλλὸς δ' ἠκόντιζεν ἀμείνονα· πέντε δ' ἀπ' ἄθλων
πρῶτος ἐκηρύχθη πεντετριάζόμενος.

Neither did any of my opponents in wrestling fall more quickly than I nor did any run at all more slowly in the *stadium*; indeed, as to the discus I did not even come near it, and I was never able to lift my feet in jumping, and a crippled athlete (consistently) threw the javelin better. As a result of the five contests I was the first to be declared five times defeated.

This contradiction of the epinician epigram makes the absurdly efficient loser its centerpiece in place of the brilliant winner. The epigrammatic “I” (no name given), far from claiming victory in the pentathlon and its five single events, proclaims utter defeat in each.³⁴ There are many parallels to this outright reversal of the epinician proper in Lucillius,³⁵ perhaps exemplified most concisely and strikingly by the monodistichon *AP* 11.80: “His fellow athletes set up here (a likeness of) Apis the boxer, for he never ever hit anybody,” wherein “Apis the boxer” is a *contradictio in adiecto*. The name Apis was certainly chosen because it suggests a sacred bull just lying there doing nothing and unfit for its or any job at all. Apis’ statue is paradoxically dedicated by his fellow athletes, i.e., (defeated) boxers like himself,³⁶ because he is the negation of all that boxing stands for, the perfect anti-boxer. He is thus a model of the Lucillian way of parodying athletics.³⁷

³⁴ See Robert (1968: 241) on the anonymity of the “athlete” and the choice of the first person; cp. Nisbet (2003a: 68–9), who points out that we have to imagine “an athlete-statue” speaking “its incised record in direct address: a sequential list of increasingly abject failures, event by event (‘πέντε...πεντετριάζόμενος’)...”

³⁵ See the series of Lucillian athletic epigrams *AP* 11.75–85 and, e.g., 208 and 258; cp. Robert (1968: 181–298; 237–41) on *AP* 11.84, “le type de l’ éloge à rebours, du contre-éloge.”

³⁶ Peter Bing suggests that we should rather think of “all the happy winners who emerged without so much as a scratch” as *e contrario* dedicators of the Apis statue, but συναγωνισταί as antecedent of the γάρ-clause rather seems to point to athletes in a predicament similar to that of Apis. The discussion in Nisbet (2003a: 47–50) is, however, inconclusive and unsatisfactory: a “synagonistes” is not so much “one who joins you in a contest, who fights on your side” (48) but a “fellow athlete” in the same category (see LSJ s.v.), and the name Apis, while certainly being “one chosen with great care,” has surely not been selected for “its Oriental exoticism” or the “Apis cult” or “predictable death,” etc. (48–9), of which there is not the slightest trace in the text but, *pace* Nisbet, indeed for its passivity: see Robert (1968: 237), who compares “Ferdinand the Bull,” a bull only in name lacking all the essential fighting characteristics.

³⁷ Cp. Lucillius *AP* 11.83 on the *stadium* runner Erasistratus whom “recently” not even

Lucillius' satirical athletic epigrams are a final step in the "deconstruction" of the epinician genre going on in Hellenistic poetry at least since Callimachus. All six categories listed above have in common that they do not so much praise an athletic success as exploit the conventions of the genre for special effects and surprising points.

I close with a few remarks on striking examples of epinician topics in non-epinician epigrams. Metaphors from running are used to illustrate the programmatic brevity of the epigram. Exemplary in this connection is Parmenion 11 GP *Garland*.³⁸

φημί πολυστιχίην ἐπιγράμματος οὐ κατὰ Μούσας
εἶναι· μὴ ζητεῖτ' ἐν σταδίῳ δόλιχον·
πόλλ' ἀνακυκλοῦται δολίχου δρόμος, ἐν σταδίῳ δέ
ὄξυς ἐλαυνομένοις πνεύματός ἐστι τόνος.

I firmly assert that many lines in an epigram are not what the Muses want. Do not look for the long course in the short one. There are many rounds in the long course; in the short, however, the strain on the breath for the runners is sharp.

An epigram is here compared to a short-distance race (*stadion*) and, in contrast, a large quantity of lines to the long-distance course (*dolichos*); and just as the competent short-distance runner is not looking for a lengthy course but for a sharp sprint, the artful epigrammatic poet should discard length and opt for pointed brevity. This programmatic preference for brevity is already implied in Callimachus 58 GP (= 8 Pf.), in which the successful poet is said to be content with one small word at most: "won!" (1–2: μικρή τις, Διόνυσσε, καλὰ πρήσσοντι ποιητῇ/ρήσις· ὁ μὲν 'νικῶ' φησι τὸ μακρότατον). Conversely, the unsuccessful will need several words to comment on his defeat. The epigrammatic "I" therefore leaves the longwinded statement to his wrong-minded rivals and asks Dionysus (1 and 6) for the short one, i.e., superiority in the art (6, ... ἐμοὶ δ', ὦναξ, ἡ βραχυσυλλαβίη). Victory and brevity are closely linked in this epigram, shortness being the essence of epigrammatic

an earthquake which shook everything succeeded in setting in motion, i.e. this "runner" is the very negation of running. See also Lucillius *AP* 11.86 on the unbelievable slowness of the *stadion* runner Pericles said by Nisbet (2003a: 94–5) to be "Loukillios at his most characteristic," and compared to its "Nikarkhan reworking," *AP* 11.119 (Nisbet has no comment on Lucillius *AP* 11.83).

³⁸ See Lausberg (1982: 37–44), who, however, seems to underrate the programmatic importance for Callimachus and other early Hellenistic epigrammatists of pointed brevity. Of 63 Callimachean epigrams, 11 are monodisticha and 28 consist of only two distichs.

poetry; and the victorious poet, the poet of the short speech, i.e., the epigrammatist. The beginning of the poem, μικρή τις... ῥήσις (1–2), and the end, ἡ βραχυσυλλαβίη (6), correspond to each other; and the reference to the victorious poet, the exemplar of the short speech, in line 2, ‘νικῶ’ φησι τὸ μακρότατον, has a double edge, meaning: “I am victorious” or “I am the champion of brevity.”³⁹

Metaphoric use of epinician topics is also conspicuous in two related erotic epigrams of Asclepiades, 6 and 35 GP (the latter also ascribed to Posidippus, 127 AB).⁴⁰ Both are also remarkable for their close and striking intertextual relationship with two poems of quite different genres.

The first epigram (6 GP = AP 5.203) has the hetaera Lysidice dedicating her “golden spur” (1–2 τὸν ἵππαστήρα μύωπα, χρύσειον... κέντρον... ποδός corresponds with 5–6 ὄπλον... χρύσειον) to Aphrodite because in sexual intercourse she used to be as efficient as the “rider” as she was as the “horse.” She can make her dedication since, even without the spurs, she completed the race thereby demonstrating no need of them (5: ἦν γὰρ ἀκέντητος τελεοδρόμος). The statement alludes to Pindar’s first Olympic ode in honor of Hieron and his victorious racehorse Pherenicus (Ol. 1.20–1: σύτο δέμας ἀκέντητον ἐν δρόμοισι παρέχων).⁴¹ The epigram is a parody of the epinician poem.

The second epigram (35 GP = Posidippus 127 AB = AP 5.202), again an erotic dedication addressed to Aphrodite (5), has the hetaera Plangon offer whip and reins after her victory against her rival Philaenida in an erotic racing competition (3: νικήσασα κέλῃτι Φιλαινίδα, used metaphorically). The last distich (5–6) of this erotic epigram asking Cypris to grant Plangon eternal fame for her victory and to make her success always remembered (σὺ δὲ τῇδε πόροις νημερτέα νίκης/δόξαν αἰέμνηστον τήνδε τιθεῖσα χάριν) is pleonastic in wording and has a mock-heroic ring. The previous line (4), however, playfully dating her

³⁹ For pointed epigrammatic brevity in Callimachus, see above all the monodisticha 35 GP (the grave-stone of Theris, the Cretan; note the striking contrast of the first and last words, σύντομος and δολιχός) and 22 GP (paradigmatic dialogue between Hercules and Archinus, the Cretan). For further discussion see, Köhnken (1993: 121–3) on Callimachus 22 GP; Voutiras (1994: 27–31) on “wortkarge Kreter” in Callimachus 11 and the New Posidippus; Asper (1997: esp. 137–8) on Callimachus 58 GP, whose one-sided comments doubt the programmatic relevance; Gutzwiller (1998b: esp. 198–200) on Callimachus 35 GP and Posidippus 102 AB, who stresses the programmatic relevance; and Meyer (2005: 189–99), esp. on Callimachus 35 and 58 GP.

⁴⁰ Cp. also Dioscorides 5.4 GP, quoted by Gow-Page (1965: 2.121): ἦνυσεν... τὸν Κύπριδος δόλιχον, another epinician metaphor.

⁴¹ Cp. Gow-Page (1965: 2.121).

victory by the neighing of horses in the evening (ἐσπερινῶν πῶλων ἄρτι φρυασσομένων) has a striking parallel in Callimachus' hymn to Athena (*Hymn* 5) which can hardly be accidental (2: τῶν ἵππων ἄρτι φρυασσομενῶν). Since the neighing of Athena's mares announcing the epiphany of the goddess is appropriate and functional in the Callimachean context, while the eventide neighing of male horses in Asclepiades/Posidippus is unexpected and rather facetious, we may safely assume that the latter is based on the former.⁴²

In effect, both these erotic "epinicians" are parodies of dedicatory epigrams for horse-race victories on the one hand, and of literary models (Pindar and Callimachus respectively) on the other.

Concerning the sophisticated Hellenistic epigrammatist and his reader, two aspects in the handling of epinician themes are worth stressing: one is the tendency to push a striking and pointed account of an athletic issue to conceptual and verbal extremes (see, e.g., the expressions of unsurpassed speed in some of the epigrams quoted above); and the other to outdo an unusual presentation of a (victorious) athlete or athletic event by an even more unusual artist's reflection on it (see, e.g., the Callimachean fighting cock discussed above). Both aspects are in evidence in the two anonymous Ladas epigrams, *AP* 16.53 and 54, of which the first, a monodistichon, characterizes the unbelievable speed of the runner: "Ladas, whether he jumped over the short-distance course or flew through, it is not even possible to say: his swiftness was superhuman" (Λάδας τὸ στάδιον εἴθ' ἤλατο εἴτε διέπτῃ, οὐδὲ φράσαι δυνατόν· δαιμόνιον τὸ τάχος). The second, consisting of four distichs, transfers Ladas' performance to Myron's art. The sculptor's statue of the runner gives the vivid and paradoxical impression that it is about to leave its base and leap at the victory-crown (54.7–8): "The bronze statue is just about to jump . . . , and the base will no longer hold it: how much swifter is art than wind" (πηδήσει τάχα χαλκὸς ἐπὶ στέφος, οὐδὲ καθέξει/ἂ βάσις. ὃ τέχνη πνεύματος ὠκυτέρα).

⁴² Cp. Gow-Page (1965: 2.141) on Asclepiades 35.4 GP.

THE PARADOX OF AMATORY EPIGRAM

Kathryn Gutzwiller

In one of his deceptively simple epigrams, Catullus shows how well he has mastered the Hellenistic art of variation:

*Nulli se dicit mulier mea nubere malle
quam mihi, non si se Iuppiter ipse petat.
dicit: sed mulier cupido quod dicit amanti,
in vento et rapida scribere oportet aqua.*

(Catullus 70)

My woman says that she prefers to marry no one more than me,
not even if Juppiter himself asks her.
She says it, but what a woman says to a lover who desires her
must be written on the wind and rushing water.

Catullus models his poem on a set of three epigrams, by Callimachus, Asclepiades, and Meleager, preserved in the *AP* in what was likely the original sequence from Meleager's *Garland*. It would be intriguing to explore in detail how Catullus conveys his anguish at Lesbia's betrayal through a process of intertextual allusion to a series of epigrams that already displayed variation one of the other within the context in which Catullus likely encountered them. I cite the poem here, however, only for a verbal play in the second couplet. In the last epigram from the *AP* sequence, the one in which Meleager demonstrates his extraordinary ability to rework and make new the best epigrams of his predecessors, an abandoned woman complains that the oaths of lovers are carried away on water (59 GP (= *AP* 5.8); cf. Callimachus 11 GP (= *AP* 5.6 = 25 Pf.), Asclepiades 9 GP (= *AP* 5.7)). Catullus modifies this line not only by reversing the gender roles, making himself the abandoned lover, but also by adding a paradoxical contrast between speaking and writing: what a woman says (*dicit*) to her lover must be written (*scribere*), not in a love poem, but on the wind and the water. Although written speech should have a greater permanency than the spoken word, the oaths of an untrue woman are here compared to the most impermanent of writing.

Catullus' image in poem 70 alludes, I suggest, to the underlying paradox of amatory epigram, namely, that it is love poetry representing private oral speech but cast in a form that descends from the public, written speech of inscription. This paradox lies at the heart of the difficult question of how amatory epigram originated. The sepulchral and dedicatory epigrams that found their way into epigram anthologies were either copied from their inscriptional sites and then gathered into papyrus collections or composed on the model of such inscriptions, perhaps initially for recitation and, more certainly, for publication in book format. But, apart from the phenomenon of the *kalos* graffiti,¹ there was no similar tradition of public inscription concerned with private erotic life. In earlier Greek culture amatory themes were confined either to lyric poetry, and so sung, or to elegiac poetry, and so usually recited at symposia. By about 300 B.C., however, epigrams on amatory topics were being composed by Asclepiades of Samos, and perhaps by Philitas of Cos and others as well. Some scholars have suggested that epigrams first entered the list of literary types through oral performance by symposiasts as dinner entertainment.² Amatory subjects fit well in such a performance environment, and many Hellenistic erotic epigrams dramatize a symposium setting. But the advent of poetry books, both edited collections of earlier verse and assemblages of new material arranged by the authors, was surely also an important factor.³ In collected form on a papyrus roll, the elegies of Mimnermus or Theognis would visually be quite similar to epigrams arranged in categories, such as the sequences with headings known from the late-third-century papyrus of Posidippus' epigrams (though erotic themes are missing there).⁴ In this new context of the book, the essential distinction between elegy and epigram, that one was recited in longer or shorter segments in variable settings and one inscribed in fixed, short form in a single location, vanished, though preserved through literary allusion to their generic heritage.

¹ On these see Slater (1998). A few erotic epigrams play with the tradition of *kalos* inscriptions: Aratus 1 GP (= AP 12.129), Anon. 27 GP (= AP 12.130), Meleager 94 GP (= AP 12.41).

² Reitzenstein (1893), Cameron (1995: 71–103). Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 338–49) emphasize the role played by Plato's exposition of love in the *Symposium*, as well as by archaic and classical sympotic culture more generally.

³ See Gutzwiller (1998b).

⁴ P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309, published by Bastianini and Gallazzi (2001) and most accessible in Austin and Bastianini (2002).

My purpose here is to examine the resulting paradox of eroticism in epigram form, and to do so through the poetry of three major epigrammatists, Asclepiades, Callimachus, and Meleager. I will show how Asclepiades molded the concise structure of inscriptional verse to convey the emotions associated with erotic experience, how Callimachus adapted his model of emotional expression to a more objective reflection on passion, and how Meleager, in the later Hellenistic period, developed for amatory epigram an internal movement that foreshadows the emotional shifts characteristic of Latin love elegy.

Asclepiades of Samos (active by ca. 310 B.C.) established much of the subject matter and imagery typical of later amatory epigram.⁵ Like erotic epigrammatists to follow, he presents an ever-changing array of love objects—both women, who include virgins and hetairas,⁶ and young males. Typically each poem is devoted to a single beloved, and in this way he preserves the focus of inscriptional epigrams on one individual or one act. His epigrams invite the reader to imagine a narrow range of settings for the represented speech act—the symposium, the bedroom, the closed entrance to the beloved's dwelling; at times, however, a poem lacks any indication of setting and so may strike the reader as the lover's private thoughts, overheard. The alternating sweetness and pain of love, the paradox of "Eros the bittersweet," is a recurring theme, one that helps to weave the variety of lovers and settings into a consistent erotic experience. Asclepiades marks his debt to earlier erotic verse by making precise allusion to Theognidean lines on amatory themes, by echoing the mythological exempla and traditional imagery that lyric poets used to shape their erotic songs, and by recalling scenes from New Comedy.⁷ But he gives this material from older genres a new shape and feel that can only be called epigrammatic.

In a few cases, he marks the genre of his amatory verse as epigrammatic by the fiction of inscription, as in this dedication of lovemaking equipment by a hetaira to Aphrodite:

⁵ Recent discussions of Asclepiades include Garrison (1978: 48–61), Hutchinson (1988: 264–76), Gutzwiller (1998b: 122–50), and Ihm (2004). The standard commentary in Gow-Page (1965) is now supplemented by Guichard (2004). On Asclepiades' date, see Gutzwiller (1995), Guichard (2004: 9–12).

⁶ 2 GP (= AP 5.85) concerns a virgin, and at least some of his other female love objects are hetairas, though Nicarete in 3 GP (= AP 5.153) and the female speaker in 19 GP (= AP 12.153) may not be. Cameron (1995: 494–519) has argued for a wide range of social status for Asclepiades' "girlfriends," a position supported by Ihm (2004); but *contra*, see Cairns (1998).

⁷ For the parallels between earlier elegy and epigram, see Kägi (1917), and on Asclepiades' use of comic form, Handley (1996).

Λυσιδίκη σοί, Κύπρι, τὸν ἵππαστήρα μύωπα
 χρύσειον εὐκνήμου κέντρον ἔθηκε ποδός,
 ᾧ πολλὸν ὑπτίον ἵππον ἐγύμνασεν, οὐδέ ποτ' αὐτῆς
 μηρὸς ἐφοινίχθη κοῦφα τινασσομένης.
 ἦν γὰρ ἀκέντητος τελεοδρόμος, οὐνεκεν ὅπλον
 σοὶ κατὰ μεσσοπύλης χρύσειον ἐκρέμασεν.

(6 GP = AP 5.203)

Lysidice has dedicated to you, Cyprian, the riding spur,
 the golden goad of her shapely foot,
 with which she exercised many a supine horse, as
 she bounced so lightly her thigh never grew red.
 Because she would finish the race without use of the spur,
 she has hung her golden tool on your entry way.

Lysidice seems to have specialized in the “horse-riding” position, with the woman sitting on the man, and she is so good at it that she has no need of her spur, which was apparently only a prop, part of her costume. The dedication, then, is merely a playful acknowledgement of Lysidice’s expertise at sexual activity. Although one just might construct an argument for the inscriptional nature of the epigram, as a mock dedication serving to advertise Lysidice’s skill, it is more likely to have been written for recitation and/or a book collection. What is certain, however, is that in the later Hellenistic period the poem was classified as amatory rather than dedicatory. Meleager placed it in the erotic section of his *Garland*, where he paired it with a similar epigram (probably by Posidippus, though jointly attributed to Asclepiades) about a hetaira who dedicates whip and reins to celebrate victory in a love-making race with another courtesan (127 AB = AP 5.202). In both these poems the faithful delineation of dedicator, deity, object of dedication, and reason for the gift serves to mark the genre as epigrammatic in the traditional sense, while the content of the epigram, by its parody of a standard inscriptional type, asserts its alternative categorization as amatory.

The voice speaking in the Lysidice epigram is closely approximate to the anonymous, objective voice that in dedicatory epigram conveys a message from the dedicator to the deity, a message publicly accessible to all those who happen to view the gift. But in another epigram, one that also plays with the inscriptional background of epigram, the voice is marked as the subjective, first-person voice of the lover:

Ἑρμιόνη πιθανῇ ποτ' ἐγὼ συνέπαιζον ἐχούση
 ζώνιον ἐξ ἀνθέων ποικίλον, ᾧ Παφίη,

χρύσεια γράμματ' ἔχον· “διόλου” δ' ἐγγράπτο “φίλει με,
καὶ μὴ λυπηθῆς ἢν τις ἔχῃ μ' ἕτερος.”

(4 GP = AP 5.158)

Once, Paphian, I was making love with persuasive Hermione,
whose sash was embroidered with many flowery colors.
And on it had been written in golden letters, “Yes, do love me,
but don't feel pained if some other man has me, too.”

Here again we find an address to Aphrodite, though not now as recipient of a dedicatory gift. Rather, the poet-lover conveys to her, from the private space of his own thoughts, a memory of, or rumination on, his sexual experience with Hermione. And since “mistress Cypris” and the “Erotes” are addressed in other of Asclepiades' amatory epigrams,⁸ these deities would seem, to the reader encountering the epigrams in a book of Asclepiades' poetry, to function as the internal addressees of the collection and so as overt signs of its erotic character.⁹ Though clearly, then, an amatory poem, the Hermione epigram yet calls attention to its inscriptional ancestry through its own embedded inscription. During the love-making, the lover discovers an “epigram” written upon her sash, one that not only welcomes the lover but also warns that others are welcomed as well.¹⁰ Despite the subjective view the reader is given of this private experience, we are left without any direct indication of the lover's emotional reaction, whether amusement or pain. We might then interpret the inscription, woven on the girl's clothing and then embedded in an amatory epigram, as an emblematic message setting out, like those gnomic inscriptions at Delphi (“nothing in excess,” “know yourself”), guidelines to steer the poet on a steady course through his represented erotic world. But while the guidelines given to the poet, and by the poet to us as readers, involve taking the pleasure of love and then letting go its pain, Asclepiades' other amatory epigrams demonstrate

⁸ 3 GP (= AP 5.153), 6 GP, 7 GP (= AP 5.207), 8 GP (= AP 5.162), 15 GP (= AP 12.46), 17 GP (= AP 12.166), and with alternative attribution to Posidippus, 36 GP (= AP 5.209).

⁹ On the psychological effect of the addresses to Eros and the Erotes in Asclepiades, see Defreyne (1993), and for such addresses to link poems in a collection, see Gutzwiller (1998b: 127–8).

¹⁰ Other examples of embedded inscriptions that play with the paradox of amatory verse in epigram form include Meleager 73 GP (= AP 5.191), 99 GP (= AP 12.23); for discussion, see Gutzwiller (1997b: 191–3). Bing (2001) discusses the use of inscription in the Hermione poem.

that the objective rules suitable for inscriptional form often conflict with the subjective, emotional experience of life as lived. Read in this way, the Hermione poem reveals precisely the paradox—of fixed form and emotional instability—that is amatory epigram.

Inscribed epigram aims at expressing a whole as succinctly as possible. Grave inscriptions mark the totality of a human life by mentioning an essential quality or accomplishment or by acknowledging the family's grief for their loss, and dedicatory inscriptions tend to commemorate a remarkable achievement or life-altering event by a simple statement of the donor's gratitude to a deity, signified by a gift. Asclepiades' principal method of retrofitting this inscriptional form to accommodate erotic experience is to focus on a single moment in time and on a single emotion. Since a love affair has a typical arc, running from first glance to passion's dying gasp, the amatory epigram that dramatizes one point on this arc cannot, like inscription, encompass the whole. It rather, in Asclepiades' inventive hand, conveys an emotional moment, fixed in time, unmoving like a monument, but so vividly that the reader can vicariously engage with the internal state of the person in love. A good example of how Asclepiades uses pinpoint focus to convey intensity of feeling is this epigram about a girl named Nicarete:

Νικαρέτης τὸ πόθοισι βεβλημένον ἡδὺ πρόσωπον
 πυκνὰ δι' ὑψηλῶν φαινόμενον θυρίδων
 αἰ χαροπαῖ Κλεοφῶντος ἐπὶ προθύροισι μάραναν,
 Κύπρι φίλη, γλυκεροῦ βλέμματος ἄστεροπαί.

(3 GP = AP 5.153)

Nicarete's sweet face, which often, struck with desire,
 appears at the high window,
 has withered under the lightning, dear Cypris, that flashed
 on her porch from Cleophon's tender glance.

In the first couplet we are invited to visualize a repeated occurrence, the girl peering from her window in the hope of glimpsing the one she desires. But in the second couplet we move from the habitual to the specific, the moment when Cleophon finally appears at her doorway. Her emotional response, the observable collapse of composure when her eyes meet his "tender glance," is expressed through the image of lightning withering whatever it strikes. By reserving the word ἄστεροπαί, the subject of the sentence that forms this quatrain, to the poem's end, the poet effectively conveys the electrifying instance in which the light emanating from Cleophon's eyes strikes and consumes Nicarete's emotional core.

Asclepiades' technique of conveying a single intense emotion experienced in a suggested setting at one point in time should be seen in the context of contemporary literary-theoretical discussion. In particular, the poet utilizes the qualities of vividness (ἐνάργεια) and persuasiveness (τὸ πιθανόν) crucial to the plain style, as explained by Demetrius in *On Style* (208–22). Although the date of *On Style* remains uncertain, it is clear that much of its material goes back to the third century B.C., and Theophrastus is cited as an important source for part of the discussion on the plain style. It is most probable, then, that the instructions on how to produce vividness and persuasiveness descend from theoretical writings contemporary with Asclepiades. Demetrius explains that vividness comes about from precise, detailed narration (ἐξ ἀκριβολογίας) that focuses on the particulars of what happened (209). Often, he says, repetition of a word (διλογία) enhances the vivid effect (211). Let us consider how Asclepiades may have adapted this stylistic manner to the writing of an amatory epigram:

λύχνε, σὲ γὰρ παρεούσα τρεῖς ὥμοσεν Ἡράκλεια
 ἥξειν, κούχ ἤκει· λύχνε, σὺ δ' εἰ θεὸς εἶ
 τὴν δολίην ἀπάμυνον· ὅταν φίλον ἔνδον ἔχουσα
 παίζῃ, ἀποσβεσθεὶς μηκέτι φῶς πάρεχε.

(9 GP = AP 5.7)

Lamp, Heracleia swore by you three times in your presence that she would come, and she hasn't come. Lamp, if you are a god, hinder that deceitful girl. Whenever she's playing, having a lover within, extinguish yourself and give them no more light.

The suggested setting is the lover's bed chamber, late at night, after a long, fruitless wait for Heracleia's promised visit, and the emotion of the moment is bitter disappointment, fueling jealousy and a fantasy of revenge. A complicated scholarly controversy has developed over the problem of where the lamp is located—in the speaker's dwelling or in Heracleia's—and whether the extinguished lamp would truly produce the desired result by ending love-making. To my mind, the lover's extravagant address to the lamp as a god signals his irrational willingness to believe that any ordinary lamp, as typical witness of love-making, has the godlike power to be manifest in many places.¹¹ What

¹¹ For a similar reading, see Marcovich (1971); different views in Giangrande (1973a) and Galli [Calderini] (1976). For the custom of making love with the lamp lit with earlier scholarship on that issue, see Cairns (1998: 171–5). Surely here extinguishing the lamp functions as a symbolic end to the sexual activity, if not necessarily an actual one.

comes vividly alive for the reader, in the brevity of epigrammatic form, is not so much the specific events, as the lover's particular *pathos*, an effect accomplished, in large part, by the verbal repetitions, of λύχνε, σέ...λύχνε, σύ and ἥξειν, κούχ ἥκει. In saying the words twice over, the lover reveals most strongly his underlying agitation.

One of Demetrius' examples of plain-style vividness is a passage from the historian Ctesias, who told the story of a Median man's suicide when an Amazon he had spared in battle rejected his love. In his suicide note, the warrior found fault with the woman as follows: ἐγὼ μὲν σέ ἔσωσα, καὶ σὺ μὲν δι' ἐμέ ἐσώθης· ἐγὼ δὲ διὰ σέ ἀπωλόμην, "I saved you and you were saved by me, but through you I have perished" (213). According to Demetrius, a champion of brevity might complain that the initial active/passive statement is redundant, but, if it were removed, the statement would lose its vividness and the emotional effect produced by that vividness (τὸ ἐκ τῆς ἐναργείας πάθος, 214). He argues as well that the use of the aorist ἀπωλόμην instead of the present is more conducive to ἐνάργεια through the sense it gives of inescapable finality. Asclepiades too is often dying of love, though, unlike the Medea, only metaphorically, and, as the following epigram shows, he uses similar stylistic maneuvers:

ἡ λαμυρή μ' ἔτρωσε Φιλαίνιον· εἰ δὲ τὸ τραῦμα
μὴ σαφές, ἀλλ' ὁ πόνος δύεται εἰς ὄνυχα.
οἶχον', Ἔρωτες, ὄλωλα, διοίχομαι· εἰς γὰρ ἐταίραν
νυστάζων ἐπέβην τήνδ', ἔθιγον τ' Αἶδα.

(8 GP = AP 5.162)

Wanton Philaenion has wounded me, and even if the wound
is not obvious, still the pain sinks to the core.
I'm lost, Eroses, I've perished, I've had it. For dozing, I trod
upon this whore, and I've touched Hades.

In the first couplet Asclepiades describes the effect of loving a hetaira like Philaenion as a painful wound, an idea doubly expressed in the verb ἔτρωσε and then the noun τραῦμα. In the second couplet the lover's wound has already progressed to the point of death, triply expressed in the series of synonymous verbs (οἶχον', ὄλωλα, διοίχομαι), which intensify with the perfect tense in the second word and the prefix in the third.¹² Neither the dramatized setting of the epigram nor any fac-

¹² Magini (2000: 24–7) argues that Asclepiades' references to death in this poem are an inheritance from inscribed epitaphs; on the mixture of sepulchral and amatory in Hellenistic epigram, see also Thomas (1998).

tual details about the relationship are here revealed; rather, the lover's pain and sense of hopelessness are repeated over and over again. In his discussion of the plain style, Demetrius reports that, according to Theophrastus, the persuasive speaker should not "say everything at length in precise detail" (οὐ πάντα ἐπ' ἀκριβείας δεῖ μακρηγορεῖν) but leave some things to the hearer's inference; as a result, the hearer who prides himself on figuring out what the speaker has omitted will be the more easily persuaded to accept the speaker's story (222). Hellenistic amatory epigram works like this. The reader is induced through vivid presentation to believe in the lover's pain and even to share it vicariously. Though some details of the affair may be presented, others are left for the reader to fill in, perhaps from personal experience. Peter Bing has called this "Ergängzungsspiel," a technique recognized long ago by Theophrastus.¹³

Callimachus was, after Asclepiades, the most influential third-century epigrammatist.¹⁴ While he repeats many of the motifs found in the poetry of the Samian, in the certainly genuine epigrams the Callimachean speaker expresses erotic attraction only to male lovers;¹⁵ heterosexual desire is confined to poems in which the speaker is an observer of passion rather than a participant. Most importantly, Callimachus' erotic epigrams differ from those of Asclepiades because, instead of representing a moment of emotional intensity, they dramatize a moment of reflection on desire. In that way, he chooses to depict different points on the arc of desire, particularly moments of rational analysis that suit an intellectual poet like Callimachus, though perhaps not every lover everywhere. As a result, his epigrams present a different set of emotions, such as regret, triumph, apprehension, vicarious sympathy, rather than the extremely intense emotions accompanied by a state of irrationality that characterize Asclepiades' erotic verse. Callimachus too is a lover, but his emotional palette is composed of subtle pastels instead of Asclepiades' intense primary colors. What he demonstrates in his epigrams is the intersection of erotic feeling with reason.

¹³ Bing (1995b); for the application of this sort of supplementation to Hellenistic art as well as literature, see Zanker (2004: 72–102).

¹⁴ For recent discussions of his erotic epigrams, see Garrison (1978: 62–70) and Gutzwiller (1998b: 213–23); Meyer (2005) includes erotic epigrams in her treatment of how Callimachus adapts inscriptional speech acts to literary epigram; in addition to the editions of Pfeiffer and Gow-Page, see Aubreton (1994) and d'Alessio (1997).

¹⁵ One epigram about male desire for a female, 63 GP (= AP 5.23 = 63 Pf.), is ascribed to Rufinus in *AP^l* and to Callimachus in *AP*.

Callimachus assumes his most distanced stance when he analyzes the love affairs of others. In this epigram we find the Asclepiadean technique of verbal repetition, but used to different effect:

ῥμοσε Καλλίγνωτος Ἰωνίδι μήποτ' ἐκείνης
 ἔξειν μήτε φίλον κρέσσονα μήτε φίλην.
 ῥμοσεν· ἀλλὰ λέγουσιν ἀληθέα τοὺς ἐν ἔρωτι
 ὄρκους μὴ δύνειν οὔατ' ἐς ἀθανάτων.
 νῦν δ' ὁ μὲν ἀρσενικῶ θέρεται πυρί, τῆς δὲ ταλαίνης
 νόμφης ὡς Μεγαρέων οὐ λόγος οὐδ' ἀριθμός.
 (11 GP = AP 5.6 = 25 Pf.)

Callignotus swore to Ionis that he would not ever hold
 any man or woman dearer than her.
 He swore it. But they say correctly that the oaths of lovers
 do not penetrate the ears of the immortals.
 Now he burns with desire for a man, and that poor girl,
 like the Megarians, is not even ranked in the list.

The repetition of ῥμοσε at the beginning of the first two couplets is not here designed to convey passionate feeling, but to set up the ἀλλά, the objective recognition that the oaths uttered by lovers are easily dishonored when desire shifts to another. Callignotus' change of heart involves not only a new lover but also a shift in the gender of the love object. And how are we to understand the speaker's emotional involvement with this situation? The pathetic ταλαίνης νόμφης in the last couplet suggests sympathy for the abandoned girl, and in an epigram by Asclepiades just such a female lover speaks, conveying her distress at abandonment by addressing herself as τάλαινα (19 GP = AP 12.153). But the Callimachean speaker weakens, perhaps even ironizes, the adjective by following it with allusion to a well-known story about the Megarians, namely, that the Delphic oracle made clear to them their unimportance in comparison with other Hellenic states.¹⁶ In suggesting Ionis' likeness to the Megarians, the authoritative speaker, assuming a role parallel to that of the Pythia, conveys his personal disengagement with her plight, and perhaps his indifference. In the context of Callimachus' other erotic epigrams, the reader may sense that this coldness toward Ionis signals the speaker's unexpressed satisfaction, or even sympathetic identification, with Callignotus' choice

¹⁶ Cf. Theocr. *Id.* 14.48–9, with scholia *ad loc.* and Gow's note (1952: *ad* 14.49) for the story of the oracle as told by Deinias.

of a male lover. Yet this is never stated expressly; the speaker's stance remains that of an analytical observer of erotic behavior.

Another epigram about third-party desire follows Asclepiades in providing a dramatic setting. Here the Callimachean speaker points out to his unnamed symposium companion another member of the company, a stranger who has been, up to this point, successfully hiding his desperate, unfulfilled passion:

ἔλκος ἔχων ὁ ξεῖνος ἐλάνθανεν· ὡς ἀνιηρόν
 πνεῦμα διὰ στηθέων—εἶδες;—ἀνηγάγετο,
 τὸ τρίτον ἡνίκ' ἔπινε, τὰ δὲ ῥόδα φυλλοβολεῦντα
 τῶνδρὸς ἀπὸ στεφάνων πάντ' ἐγένοντο χαμαί.
 ὥπτηται μέγα δὴ τι. μὰ δαίμονας, οὐκ ἀπὸ ῥυσμοῦ
 εἰκάζω, φωρὸς δ' ἔχνια φῶρ ἔμαθον.

(13 GP = AP 12.134 = 43 Pf.)

That stranger has been concealing his wound. Did you see?
 What a painful sigh he brought up from his chest
 when he drank that third toast, and the rose petals, cascading
 down from the man's garland, all lie there on the floor.
 He's been thoroughly roasted. By god, I'm not just guessing,
 but it takes a thief to spot the tracks of a thief.

Here we have a series of images and motifs common in erotic epigram: love's wound, the toast to the beloved, the garland withering in sympathy with the lover's distress, the destructive fires of desire. But again, they are objectified, made into clues for an intellectual puzzle. The moment dramatized in the poem is not that instant when hopeless longing reigns, but the instant when the speaker recognizes another's desire, through cool observation and analysis. The revelation at the end that the speaker knows the signs of love because of his own experience brings him into the company of those who have been deeply disturbed by erotic longing. But the effect is now more to establish the speaker's authority on such matters and his reliability in assessing others than to express sympathetic engagement with the wounded stranger.

Other epigrams do, however, concern the Callimachean speaker's own love affairs, yet always somewhat obliquely, or "at a slight angle," as E.M. Forster famously said of Cavafy.¹⁷ Take, for instance, the *paraklausithyron*, or love song uttered before the closed door of the beloved, which Asclepiades neatly adapted to epigram by dramatizing the lover's

¹⁷ Forster (1961: 91).

tenacity as he braves all kinds of inclement weather during a long night spent outside the beloved's house.¹⁸ In Callimachus, however, the lover does not speak from deepest despair during the night of exclusion, but later, to the beloved in an unspecified setting, to excuse his *komos* as atypical behavior, compelled by wine and desire, and to offer a picture of himself as a tender lover, even when performing this customary revel in which strong desire sometimes turns to violent assault:

εἰ μὲν ἐκών, Ἀρχῖν', ἐπεκώμασα, μυρία μέμφου,
 εἰ δ' ἄκων ἦκω, τὴν προπέτειαν ἔα.
 ἄκρητος καὶ ἔρωσ μ' ἠνάγκασαν, ὧν ὁ μὲν αὐτῶν
 εἶλκεν, ὁ δ' οὐκ εἶα τὴν προπέτειαν ἔαν·
 ἐλθὼν δ' οὐκ ἐβόησα τίς ἢ τίνος, ἀλλ' ἐφίλησα
 τὴν φλὴν. εἰ τοῦτ' ἔστ' ἀδίκημ', ἀδικέω.

(8 GP = AP 12.118 = 42 Pf.)

If my *komos* was made willingly, Archinus, censure me at length,
 but if unwillingly I came, forgive my rashness.
 Unmixed wine and love compelled me, one of which dragged me
 there and the other forbade me to let go my rashness.
 On arrival I didn't call out my name and lineage but merely
 kissed the doorpost. If that is sin, then I have sinned.

The motif of compulsion under the force of desire comes directly from Asclepiades (ἔλκει γάρ μ' ὁ κρατῶν...θεός, 11.5 GP (= AP 5.64.5)), as does the shouting at the door (θύρην πρὸς μίαν...ἐβόησα, 14.4–5 GP (= AP 5.167.4–5)). But by representing himself explaining his *komos* to Archinus rather than directly experiencing it, Callimachus gains the opportunity to defend the irrationality of his behavior even as he constructs a picture of his restraint in only kissing the doorpost, rather than shouting or assaulting. The result is an attempt at persuasion of the beloved, conducted not under the irrational impetus of desire but with calculation built on reflection about past behavior.

In other Callimachean epigrams we find the same deflection of desire's intensity, of erotic pleasure or pain. In 9 GP (= AP 12.139 = 44 Pf.), the speaker expresses fear that Menexenus will awaken the "fire under the ash," feelings of passionate longing that the speaker

¹⁸ 11 GP (= AP 5.64), 12 GP (= AP 5.145), 13 GP (= AP 5.164), 42 GP (= AP 5.189), the last being attributed to Asclepiades in *AP* and Meleager in *APL*. Another epigram by Asclepiades, 14 GP (= AP 5.167), seems not to dramatize the *paraklausithyron* itself, but a memory of it, since the lover's complaint to Zeus uttered during the night of exclusion is quoted in recollection. The standard work on the *paraklausithyron* is Copley (1956).

knew in the past and had hoped to quell for the future. In 7 GP (= *AP* 12.148 = 32 Pf.), the lover begs the mercenary Menippus not to point out his poverty, for this is “the most unlovely thing that I have from you.” Here the speaker acknowledges the pain (ἀλγέω) that the boy’s “bitter word” will cause, but the moment dramatized is not that in which he hears Menippus’ rejection and hurts but an anticipatory moment in which he tries to ward off the painful honesty that he knows will come. 10 GP (= *AP* 12.149 = 45 Pf.) concerns a happy occasion, the lover’s fulfillment of desire when, after twenty days of hesitation, Menecrates gave himself willingly to the speaker’s embraces. But once again the experience is presented to us from a later point of reflection, and the speaker’s state of mind is one of triumph, even gloating, not the sweet mutuality of pleasure hoped for by Asclepiades, when “one cloak covers two lovers and the Cyprian is praised by both” (1.3–4 GP (= *AP* 5.169.3–4)).

In one epigram Callimachus does represent himself in the throes of passionate longing:

ἤμισύ μεν ψυχῆς ἔτι τὸ πνέον, ἤμισυ δ’ οὐκ οἶδ’
 εἴτ’ Ἔρος εἴτ’ Αἰδης ἥρπασε, πλὴν ἀφανές.
 ἦ ῥά τιν’ ἐς παίδων πάλιν ὄχετο; καὶ μὲν ἀπεῖπον
 πολλάκι “τὴν δρῆστιν μὴ νυ δέχεσθε, νέοι.”
 Θεύτιμον δίφησον· ἐκέῖσε γὰρ ἡ λιθόλευστος
 κείνη καὶ δύσερως οἶδ’ ὅτι που στρέφεται.

(4 GP = *AP* 12.73 = 41 Pf.)

5 Θεύτιμον O. Schneider | δίφησον Jacobs: οὐκισυνιφησον P

Only half of my soul still breathes; the other half I don’t know
 whether Eros or Hades has taken it, just that it’s gone.
 Has it escaped again to some boy love? I often warned them,
 “Boys, don’t take in that runaway slave.”
 Go, look for Theutimus. For I know that soul of mine,
 tortured and love-stricken, is wandering somewhere there.

Although at the opening the speaker claims not to know what has happened to half of his soul, whether it is in love or dead (clearly, much the same thing), in fact, he knows quite well that, against his will, half his soul has run off to the boy Theutimus.¹⁹ George Walsh has cited this epigram in his important discussion of “thought in motion.”²⁰ He

¹⁹ The name comes from an adaptation by Q. Lutatius Catulus (fr. 1 Courtney), one of our earliest examples of Latin erotic epigram.

²⁰ Walsh (1990: 13–4); further development of the concept in Walsh (1991).

signifies by this term an Alexandrian innovation in which thought is represented as if in “real time,” and this phenomenon can be detected, he argues, when the speaker is caught off guard by an unexpected idea, emotion, or turn of thought. There are, however, better examples of “thought in motion” among Callimachus’ nonerotic epigrams, such as the Heraclitus epitaph (34 GP = *AP* 7.80 = 2 Pf.) or that for Timonoe (40 GP = *AP* 7.522 = 15 Pf.). Here the technique does not so much represent an actual realization as provide Callimachus a mechanism for acknowledging current desire. Asclepiades had introduced the motif of the divided soul to illustrate what it feels like to be “half-dead” from the force of erotic passion (17 GP = *AP* 12.166), but Callimachus uses it to create a rational space from which he may examine his own desire even as he is enthralled by it. The half of the soul that loves is simply gone, absent from the sentience of the poet who speaks, objectified as other and so as a legitimate subject for analysis and comment. But in the last couplet the feminine κείνη, agreeing with ψυχή not ἡμῖς, reveals, subtly, that in fact the division between loving half and reasoning half is mere fiction, since the poet knows quite well to whom his soul is drawn. The epigram is, then, the exception that proves the rule about Callimachus’ self-distancing from desire in his erotic epigrams, since by this ploy of the divided soul Callimachus creates a means through which he may reflect on his passion even as he experiences it.

Asclepiades’ representation of a strong erotic emotion, often articulated in a dramatized setting, and Callimachus’ representation of reflection upon erotic experience, often in a dramatized conversation with another, provided later epigrammatists fundamental models for accommodating amatory content within epigrammatic form. As the best preserved practitioner of the type in the later Hellenistic period, Meleager of Gadara set mainly these third-century epigrammatists, with the addition of Posidippus, as the marked predecessors for his own brand of erotic verse.²¹ Meleager interwove well over a hundred of his own amatory poems into his great anthology, where he typically grouped his compositions with thematically similar earlier epigrams.²² He writes of both male and female lovers but devotes interspersed

²¹ His most important intermediate source was an anonymous epigrammatist who focused on pederastic topics and drew heavily on the language and motifs used by Asclepiades and Callimachus; see Gow-Page (1965: 2.560–1).

²² For the organization of Meleager’s *Garland* into books, see Cameron (1993: 19–33), and for the arrangement of poems within books, see Gutzwiller (1998b: 276–322).

“cycles” of epigrams to three special individuals—Heliodora, Zenophila, and Myiscus.²³ Scholars have emphasized Meleager’s complex variation of earlier epigrams, characterized by combination of motifs taken from more than one poem and by an expanded use of imagery, both the traditional imagery of archaic and classical Greek poetry and new motifs developed in the Hellenistic period.²⁴ What has gone mostly unnoticed is his introduction of movement into epigram form. He does this by a depiction of emotional change within a single epigram or by giving an intimation of how a love affair develops over time through a series of epigrams devoted to one individual. This depiction of the lover’s variable feelings, within the brief compass of the epigram form, provides a pathway to the development of Latin erotic elegy, with its more complex series of emotional stances.

The following quatrain illustrates how, in following Asclepiades’ manner of dramatizing a moment in time within a suggested physical setting, Meleager introduces a shift in emotion, as the lover reacts to a changing perception of his environment:

ἄρπασται· τίς τόσον ἐναιχμάσαι ἄγριος ἦεν,
 τίς τόσος ἀντᾶραι καὶ πρὸς Ἑρωτα μάχην;
 ἅπτε τάχος πεύκας· καίτοι κτύπος· Ἥλιοδώρας·
 βαῖνε πάλιν στέρνων ἐντὸς ἐμῶν, κραδίη.

(55 GP = AP 12.147)

1 ἐναιχμάσαι Scaliger ἐναιχμάσσαι P ἦεν Beckby εἶναι P

She’s been kidnapped! Who would be cruel enough to wage such a war?

Who would launch an attack even against the god Eros?

Quick, light the torch. Yet, there’s a footfall. Heliodora’s.

Jump back into my chest, oh heart.

Scholars have been uncertain just what scene we are to imagine here, whether the speaker arrives at Heliodora’s dwelling to find it unoccupied or, more likely, expects to find her waiting for him in his own bedchamber. But the poet is not so concerned with the details of the scene, although a setting there must be for this vivid depiction of his initial terror at the possibility another has taken his beloved. Rhianus 5 GP (= AP 12.146), apparently echoing Callimachus 1 GP (= AP 12.102 = 32 Pf.) and likely paired with this epigram in the *Garland*, is

²³ On erotic cycles in Meleager and Roman poetry, see Ypsilanti (2005).

²⁴ On the art of variation in Hellenistic epigram generally, and Meleager particularly, see Tarán (1979) and Gutzwiller (1998b: 227–322).

built on the metaphor of sexual conquest as hunting and capture (with ἄγρεύσας as its first word); there the desired boy has eluded the speaker but is easily seduced by others. At the same time, the suggestion of a specific scene in the Heliodora poem is reminiscent of New Comedy, where the forcible removal of a girl from a house is sometimes imaged as military assault (e.g., Men. *Perik.* 467–85). The knowledgeable reader who is aware of such precedents may assume that Heliodora has willingly gone off with another and the love-struck speaker simply imagines a forced removal. But that complex supplementation of the drama is suggested only by the first couplet. In the second, a call to the slaves to get a torch for a rescue attempt is cut short by the sound of a step, which the lover immediately assumes, or recognizes, is Heliodora's. She returns, or perhaps was there all along—again, the dramatic details are secondary. The epigram is about how it feels to be so alarmed and then to realize all is well: it is as if, we are told, the lover's heart leapt out of his breast and then returns. This shift from one emotion to another is, I argue, characteristic of Meleager's epigrams.²⁵

Meleager dramatizes emotional change in a variety of ways. In the following example, the lover is depicted giving instructions to a slave:

ἄγγελον τάδε, Δορκάς· ἰδοὺ πάλι δεύτερον αὐτῇ
καὶ τρίτον ἄγγελον, Δορκάς, ἅπαντα· τρέχε·
μηκέτι μέλλε· πέτου· βραχὺ μοι βραχὺ, Δορκάς, ἐπίσχε·
Δορκάς, ποῖ σπεύδεις πρὶν σε τὰ πάντα μαθεῖν;
πρόσθε δ' οἷς εἴρηκα πάλαι—μᾶλλον δέ—τί ληρῶ;
μηδὲν ὅλως εἴπης· ἀλλ' ὅτι—πάντα λέγε·
μὴ φείδου τάδε πάντα λέγειν· καίτοι τί σε, Δορκάς,
ἐκπέμπω, σὺν σοι καὶ τὸς ἰδοὺ προάγων;

(71 GP = AP 5.182)

7 τάδε πάντα λέγειν Jacobs τὰ πάντα λέγε P (non sane)

Tell her this, Dorcas. Go and tell her twice and again
the third time, tell her all of it. Go at a run.
Don't delay. Go flying. No, wait a minute, hold up a bit, Dorcas.
Dorcas, where are you rushing to before knowing it all?
Add to what I told you before—no, wait—What am I saying?
Don't say anything at all. But just—no, say it all.
Don't hesitate to say absolutely everything. And yet why, Dorcas,
am I sending you? Look, I'm going with you.

²⁵ Dioscorides 1 GP (= AP 5.56) is one possible forerunner of the technique. The poet lists his mistress's physical charms only to realize that he is offering "bones to dogs," that is, inviting potential rivals.

Asclepiades 25 GP (= AP 5.181) and 26 GP (= AP 5.185), followed by Posidippus 124 AB (= AP 5.183), provided the earliest known examples of such “thumb-nail mimes,”²⁶ but with the difference that the third-century epigrams, involving instructions on purchasing supplies for a dinner party, were only tangentially related to erotic activity. In Meleager’s poem we never actually learn what Dorcas is being sent to announce, since the focal point is the lover’s anxiety about the message. The high number of repeated words (ἄγγελον, ἄγγελον; βραχύ, βραχύ; πάντα λέγε, πάντα λέγειν)—a trick used by Asclepiades to enhance the vividness of the emotional scene—combines with the suggestions of the slave’s action, as she starts out and is then called back again, to convey the lover’s intense state of agitation. The instability produced by his anxiety impedes settled rational thought, and his indecision ends only with the impulse to go in person. By closing the lover’s sequence of shifting thoughts with the sudden alteration of plans, the poet effectively ends with a change of scene, as both the lover and Dorcas exit from our mental view. This miniature mime is not, then, just a dramatization of a (one-sided) conversation, but a depiction of an emotionally driven change of mind, quite unlike the dramatizations of a single emotion or thought in Asclepiades and Callimachus.

Meleager is famous for his expansive use of images, and he has sometimes been accused of substituting the discourse of erotic imagery for the depiction of truly felt emotion. But as the following example illustrates, references to Greek deities and mythological exempla had become, by Meleager’s day, a standard way of conveying the effects of love:

πωλείσθω καὶ ματρὸς ἔτ' ἐν κόλποισι καθεύδων,
 πωλείσθω· τί δέ μοι τὸ θρασὺ τοῦτο τρέφειν;
 καὶ γὰρ σιμὸν ἔφυ καὶ ὑπόπτερον, ἄκρα δ' ὄνου
 κνίζει, καὶ κλαῖον πολλὰ μεταξὺ γελᾷ.
 πρὸς δ' ἔτι λοιπὸν ἄθρεπτον, αἰεταλόν, ὃς δὲ δεδορκός,
 ἄγριον, οὐδ' αὐτῇ ματρὶ φίλα τιθασόν,
 πάντα τέρας· τοιγὰρ πεπράσεται· εἴ τις ἀπόπλους
 ἔμπορος ὠνεῖσθαι παῖδα θέλει, προσίτω.
 καίτοι λίσσεται, ἰδοῦ, δεδακρυμένος· οὐ σ' ἔτι πωλῶ·
 θάρσει· Ζηνοφίλα σύντροφος ὧδε μένε.

5
10

(38 GP = AP 5.178)

²⁶ The term is from Gow-Page (1965: 2.132).

Let him be sold, though he still sleeps in his mother's lap,
 let him be sold. Why should I raise that bold brat?
 For he was born snub-nosed and winged, and he scratches
 with his nails, and though he cries a lot, he's also laughing.
 In addition, he's unmanageable, a constant talker, sharp of gaze, 5
 wild, and not at all obedient to his own mother.
 Altogether a monster. And so he will be sold. If some merchant
 sailing away wants to buy a boy, let him come forward.
 And yet, look, he's begging and weeping. I won't sell you.
 Cheer up. Stay here as a playmate for Zenophila. 10

Here the poet plays the role of slave trader, in an attempt to sell the baby Eros. The motif has visual equivalents, such as in a fourth-style painting from Pompeii and a later mosaic from Antioch, in which an old merchant has one Eros in a cage while others around about perform typical activities, holding a torch or bow, fishing from a boat, fighting with cocks.²⁷ Meleager's epigrammatic mime indicates that, by the late Hellenistic period, such scenes were likely understood as visual images of typical erotic experience. The opening statement, that the infant god is sleeping peacefully on his mother's lap, signals that the speaker occupies that point on the arc of love when desire is dormant, with previous pain now past and new desire not yet present. It is then, and then alone, that he can recognize, and resist, the power of Eros, who is, like a naughty child, both adorable and exasperating. But here again, in the final couplet, we find the characteristic turn from one emotional state to another. The infant awakes and weeps at being sold, and the speaker immediately melts and relents. The last line reveals the reality of the erotic relationship behind this mimelike image—the emerging desire for Zenophila, not to be resisted.

I have focused on Meleager's illustration of unstable and shifting emotions within a single epigram because this characteristic feature of his erotic verse, largely unnoticed, provides an important bridge from earlier amatory epigram to the complex emotional states represented within the elegies of Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid. Meleager also found ways to depict emotional change that was not of the moment but progressive over time. One such method was the composition of companion epigrams, two poems on the same theme and set together

²⁷ *LIMC* "Eros/Amor, Cupido" 54–5 and "Eros" 336/418, on which see Levi (1947: 1.192–5).

in his anthology. A pair of epigrams addressed to the Morning Star, and linked by very similar language in their first couplets, provides an example:

ὄρθρε, τί μοι, δυσέραστε, ταχὺς περὶ κοῖτον ἐπέστης
 ἄρτι φίλας Δημοῦς χρωτὶ χλειαυομένῳ;
 εἴθε πάλιν στρέψας ταχινὸν δρόμον Ἑσπερος εἴης,
 ὃ γλυκὺ φῶς βάλλων εἰς ἐμὲ πικρότατον.
 ἦδη γὰρ καὶ πρόσθεν ἐπ' Ἀλκμήνην Διὸς ἦλθες
 ἀντίος· οὐκ ἀδαής ἐσσι παλινδρομῆς.

(27 GP = AP 5.172)

Morning Star, cruel to lovers, why do you so soon stand above my bed
 when I'm just now warmed by Demo's flesh?
 I wish that you would do a quick run back and become Hesperus,
 you who cast your sweet light most bitterly upon me.
 For also on an earlier occasion you came to Alcmena to help Zeus.
 You are not unlearned in backwards running.

ὄρθρε, τί νῦν, δυσέραστε, βραδὺς περὶ κόσμον ἐλίσση
 ἄλλος ἐπεὶ Δημοῦς θάλπεθ' ὑπὸ χλανίδι;
 ἀλλ' ὅτε τὰν ῥαδινὰν κόλποις ἔχον, ὥκὺς ἐπέστης
 ὧς βάλλων ἐπ' ἐμοὶ φῶς ἐπιχαιρέκακον.

(28 GP = AP 5.173)

Morning Star, cruel to lovers, why do you revolve slowly across the
 sky
 when another one is warmed under Demo's cloak?
 When I held that slender girl to my breast, you stood over me
 straightway, casting a light happy in my sorrow.

Here the poet illustrates two crucial *pathê* in an erotic relationship, the happiness of success, laced with anxiety about its continuance, and jealousy at the mistress's acceptance of another, marked by painful nostalgia for the lover's former happiness. By referring in the second poem to the bedroom scene in the first, the poet makes clear the sequential relationship, and the cycle of success and rejection. In this way Meleager both preserves and moves beyond fixity on a single feeling at a single moment, typical of earlier amatory epigram. He thus attempts to overcome the paradox inherent in the form, by pairing similar but oppositional points in the love affair, and so by this means suggests the shape of love's whole.

The devotion of a number of epigrams to one beloved, a practice unknown before Meleager, also allows the poet to outline a narrative

moving through time.²⁸ His principal love objects, and even some of the more minor ones, have characteristics that remain constant from one poem to another. So Zenophila is depicted as a musician (29 and 30 GP (= *AP* 5.193 and 140)), while Heliodora is complimented only for her conversational talents (43, 44, and 47 GP (= *AP* 5.137, 141, and 148)). Among the minor figures, Heracleitus has beautiful eyes (91 and 76 GP (= *AP* 12.63 and 94)), as does Timarion (61 and 62 GP (= *AP* 12.109 and 113)), while Diodorus attracts with his shapely chest (76 and 91 GP (= *AP* 12.94 and 63)). A few epigrams mark transitional points in the cycle of the love affair. The poet remembers when he first met Zenophila (32 GP (= *AP* 5.149)) and elsewhere (103 GP (= *AP* 12.101)) claims that Myiscus was the first to wound him, and so to trample his boasts of philosophical resistance to love. A lament for Heliodora (56 GP (= *AP* 7.476)) shows that the poet still cared for her at the time of her death. But for the erotic epigrammatist, the important thing is not these quasi-biographical facts, but the changing emotional moments that occur as the relationship progresses. As a result, we find epigrams that celebrate the beauty and charms of the love object, that document the poet's obsession with one individual (104 GP (= *AP* 12.106)), that convey his anxiety about possible rivals (34 GP (= *AP* 5.152)), that express his despair at never escaping the power of Eros (10 GP (= *AP* 5.212)), and that pray for release from passionate longing (54 GP (= *AP* 5.215)). These moments occur in all his love affairs, and represent the cycle of sweet desire and painful loss that is the Greek model for erotic relationships. By representing them one by one in single epigrams and yet suggesting narrative movement through the reappearance of individual love objects, Meleager both maintains the paradox of amatory epigram and points toward its dissolution in new poetic forms.

²⁸ Meleager is followed in this practice not only by Catullus, who composed epigrams for both Lesbia and Juventius, but also by Philodemus, whose beloved, perhaps his wife, was called Xanthippe; for the latter, see Sider (1997: 34–8).

BUCOLIC EPIGRAM

Karl-Heinz Stanzel

Bucolic poetry is above all linked to the name Theocritus. His *Idylls*, which we could also call epic mimes, present herdsmen and other members of the rural world singing songs as they go about their daily work and tend their flocks. In many of these poems the herdsmen sing in an *agon*, a contest, and the winner gets a prize. An important theme in almost all these poems, moreover, is the herdsmen's erotic suffering.

Beginning with the Hellenistic period, however, we also encounter epigrams that contain motifs similar to those in Theocritus' *Idylls*. Despite epigram's traditional venue, monumental dedications and grave inscriptions, and its association with higher classes, these poems depict a country setting and deal with herdsmen or others of their world. These "bucolic" epigrams come mainly from the so-called Peloponnesian school of epigrammatists, as distinct from the Ionian and the Phoenician epigrammatic school.¹ Among its practitioners are the poetess Anyte of Tegea, called the inventor of the bucolic epigram,² Leonidas of Tarentum, and the nearly contemporary poets Perses, Nicias, Mnasilces, and Simias. This "school" seems to be more traditional and folksy than the Ionic tradition in which we find subtler and more refined types of epigram, for example, the more urbane sympotic and erotic types. Anyte and Leonidas, by contrast, work with the traditional inscriptional sub-genres of dedication and epitaph. But despite being traditional in matters of form, both Anyte and Leonidas introduce new subjects into epigrammatic poetry.³ We can also observe in their poems the transition from stone to literature, a process which has recently been studied extensively by Gutzwiller (1998b: 47–114). In sum, then, they share certain poetic tendencies without having the

¹ For this somewhat problematic distinction made by Reitzenstein (1893: 121–3), see, e.g., Degani (1997: 1110).

² See Elliger (1975: 377) and Rossi (2001: 46); and for the beginnings of bucolic epigram, Kroll (1964: 207). For "Plato" *AP* 9.823 and *AP* 13, see Rossi (2001: 46 with nn. 86 and 87), Bernsdorff (2001: 105 and 142–4).

³ See, e.g., Geoghegan's introduction (1979: 9). For bucolic epigrams as dedicatory or funerary epigrams, Bernsdorff (2001: 130–2).

local ties and close personal interaction we normally think of as constituting a "school."⁴

Anyte and Leonidas are roughly Theocritus' contemporaries. Anyte is probably somewhat older, Leonidas perhaps a bit younger.⁵ While questions of influence from Leonidas to Theocritus or *vice versa* cannot be answered with certainty, Anyte's likely priority *vis-à-vis* Theocritus may mean that the early tradition of bucolic epigram had some influence on his bucolic *Idylls*. In fact, Anyte's designation as a μελοποιός by the lemmata to some of her epigrams led Reitzenstein to posit the influence of not just an epigrammatic, but also of a lyric tradition of bucolic poetry on Theocritus.⁶

Anyte does indeed seem to have influenced Theocritus. The very first line of *Id.* 1: ὁδύ τι τὸ ψιθύρισμα καὶ ἅ πίτυς, αἰπόλε, τήνα, "sweetly sings that whispering of the pine, goatherd,"⁷ alludes to Anyte 18.2 GP (= *APL* 228.2): ὁδύ τοι ἐν χλωροῖς πνεῦμα θροεῖ πετάλοις, "sweetly sounds the breeze in the green foliage." But although Anyte may indeed have influenced Theocritus, we must not assume that there was an Arcadian bucolic poetry before his. Nothing in Anyte's epigrams suggests a generic link with the bucolic poetry of Theocritus.⁸

Besides the epigrams of Anyte and Leonidas, there are six bucolic epigrams in the collection attributed to Theocritus. We shall see that although there are certain differences between the poems of Anyte and Leonidas, a line can be drawn from one to the other, and the

⁴ For a critical view on this distinction of epigrammatic schools, see also Gutzwiller (1998b: 53, n. 21 with further literature) and Gow-Page (1965: 2.91).

⁵ For the dating of Anyte's *floruit* to about 300 B.C., see Gutzwiller (1998b: 54, n. 22 with further literature), and with more detail Bernsdorff (2001: 110–9) who emphasizes the uncertainty of an early date. Gutzwiller (1998b: 88–9) sees the most likely dating for the publication of the collection of Leonidas' epigrams in the second quarter of the third century whereas Gow placed this poet's *floruit* in the middle or even in the second half of the third century (Gow (1958b) tries to date the poet into a period of decline). For Leonidas, compare also Bernsdorff (2001: 121–2).

⁶ See Reitzenstein (1893: 121–31). Gutzwiller (1998b: 54, n. 23) gives a plausible explanation for it. Perhaps we need not conclude that this term reflects actual knowledge of her lyric poetry. The supposition of this so-called "Arcadian bucolic" was highly influential at the beginning of the 20th century: Johannes Geffcken (1896), for example, seems to presuppose a conception of bucolic poetry in accord with Reitzenstein's ideas.

⁷ For this influence, see, e.g., Gutzwiller (1998b: 71–2) and Geoghegan (1979: 162). For the sweetness of nature see Fowler (1989: 23–31).

⁸ For the problem of Anytean Arcadian bucolic poetry, see Gow-Page (1965: 2.91) where the question of such an origin is left open; for a more critical view, see now Gutzwiller (1998b: 55, n. 27).

influence is clear. The bucolic epigrams of Theocritus are another matter. While we might expect to find influences there from Anyte, Theocritus' bucolic epigrams (as distinct from his *Idylls*, as seen above) exhibit not a trace.

The question of what makes a poem "bucolic" is unsettled and has long bedevilled scholarship on Theocritus. Should we, for instance, use this term to describe *Id.* 10, "The Reapers," where we do not meet herdsmen but rural workers?⁹ Similar uncertainty applies also in the case of the "bucolic epigram." "Bucolic" is never applied to epigram by ancient sources, and different modern scholars designate the same epigram now as bucolic, now as pastoral (Bernsdorff 2001),¹⁰ now simply as rural, since some omit the herdsmen while retaining the setting. Recently Laura Rossi has argued for a clear distinction between bucolic and rural epigram in order to establish an ideal type of bucolic epigram; she identifies certain markers of "bucolicity" such as the presence of herdsmen (not only cowherds, but also shepherds, etc.) or animals, a *locus amoenus*, or music, but only when the *syrtinx*, the herdsmen's instrument, is mentioned.¹¹ To my mind, however, this distinction is too strict, at least for the beginnings, i.e., Anyte and Leonidas, since it retrojects Theocritean characteristics onto earlier poems. What is clear is that Theocritean bucolic later had considerable influence on epigrams with bucolic themes, though certain features were unsuited to the genre (e.g., the *agon*, so important for Theocritus, the amoebaeon structure, or the love-theme).¹²

Here I will concentrate mainly on the three authors mentioned above, although there is a rather rich tradition of bucolic epigrams in later times too.¹³ In epigram, variation plays a special role, and allusion to precedents occurs despite the genre's small form.¹⁴ Therefore

⁹ For the term "bucolic" in Theocritus, see, e.g., Hunter (1999: 5–12) and Rossi (2001: 30–1, with further literature in nn. 16, 17, and 19).

¹⁰ See, for example, Whitmore (1918: 616) who defines the pastoral spirit in literature "as the more or less realistic presentation of rustic human nature in a setting of natural scenery." For differences between bucolic epigrams and the *Idylls* of Theocritus see now Bernsdorff (2001: 127–38).

¹¹ Rossi (2001: 29–64, esp. 31).

¹² On Theocritean influence on later epigrams, see Rossi (2001: 51–57); on bucolic motifs in epigrams, see now also the detailed discussion in Bernsdorff (2001: 139–80); for Doric dialect in epigram, Bernsdorff (2001: 91–2).

¹³ For the chronological development of bucolic epigram, see now Rossi (2001: 46–51) and Bernsdorff (2001: 104–26).

¹⁴ The art of variation in Hellenistic love epigram was examined by Ludwig (1968)

the later bucolic epigrams hew closely to their antecedents and include few new developments. For this tradition I will give only some hints and examples.

While Anyte seems to be a pioneer in introducing bucolic themes into the epigrammatic tradition,¹⁵ many of the twenty-one epigrams ascribed to her¹⁶ exhibit traditional funerary and dedicatory features linked to the original inscriptional function of the genre.¹⁷ Against this traditional back-drop, however, we see the poetess extending the generic boundaries in interesting ways. In addition to commemorating human death, she also composes sepulchral epigrams for animals and even insects;¹⁸ among her dedicatory epigrams, one is clearly bucolic; and bucolic themes are prominent among her “descriptive” epigrams. Oddly, however, this is hardly the world of bucolic poetry: inscribed dedications are not generally linked with herdsmen or other members of the rural world.¹⁹ Anyte’s epigrams are thus experimental insofar as she tries to extend the genre’s potential to other fields.

Her one bucolic epigram that certainly qualifies as dedicatory is 3 GP (= *APL* 291):²⁰

Φριζοκόμα τόδε Πανὶ καὶ αὐλιάσιν θέτο Νύμφαις
δῶρον ὑπὸ σκοπιᾶς Θεύδοτος οἰονόμος
οὔνεχ’ ὑπὸ ζαθέοιο θέρευς μέγα κεκηῶτα
παῦσαν ὀρέξασαι χερσὶ μελιχρὸν ὕδωρ.

The shepherd Theodotus placed this gift here under the peak
For bristly Pan and the Nymphs of the grotto
Because they refreshed him, weary from the summer’s heat,
By offering him sweet water with their hands.

and then studied in depth by Tarán (1979). In her introduction (1979: 4) she enumerates bucolic epigrams that relate in this manner without discussing the problem fully. For this feature of Hellenistic epigram see also the article of Sens in this volume.

¹⁵ For this aspect of her production see Geoghegan’s introduction (1979: 9).

¹⁶ For edition and commentary, Geoghegan (1979), who adopts the numbering of Gow-Page.

¹⁷ For the epitaphs on young women who died before marriage see Greene’s interpretation (2000: 16–22), along with Stehle (2001) and Skinner (2001: 209–10).

¹⁸ See the remarks of Geoghegan (1979: 9), Gutzwiller (1998b: 54–5 and 62–7), Fowler (1989: 123–7), and Greene (2000: 24–7); further archeological material and the cultural and literary background is discussed by Georgoudi (1984).

¹⁹ Rossi (2001: 57–62) discusses the inscriptions referring to the dedications of herdsmen.

²⁰ The translations of Anyte’s epigrams are Gutzwiller’s (1998b), with modifications. For pastoral epigrams that can be classified as dedicatory see Bernsdorff (2001: 132 with n. 168).

The scene of this epigram is a spring with a sanctuary adorned with statues of the Nymphs (4). The epigram names Theodotus as dedicator and supplies the rationale behind his offering to the Nymphs and Pan: it is an act of gratitude for refreshing him with water. At the same time, the deictic τὸδε (1) fails to specify what the herdsman's gift was, whether a sculptural relief of the Nymphs or a more appropriately rustic item.²¹ The epigram can be called bucolic because of its setting, a country spring, but also because the dedicator seems to be a herdsman (οἰονόμος, 2). The term, which does not occur in Theocritus, means either "shepherd" or "solitary person." The ambiguity may be deliberate.

The epigram describes a simple rustic's dedication: its two couplets, as short as most other Anytean epigrams, evoke an everyday rural situation. The spring, nature's gift in the heat of the day, relieves nature's heat. This epigram thus leads us from dedicatory epigrams to those with other purposes. For while it includes the herdsman's dedication, it also reveals one of Anyte's main poetic interests. Refreshment, relief from summer's heat, plays a central part even in non-dedicatory epigrams²² and looms large in most of Anyte's other bucolic epigrams. Not dedicatory *stricto sensu*, but descriptive, they all contain scenes of a *locus amoenus* and refer to a place that offers refreshment from the heat of the day. The poetess is thus implicated in her own game of (self-)variation. Moreover, she opens the door to a rich tradition developed by later poets.²³

A quasi-inscriptional situation is maintained in an epigram in which a springside Herm addresses passersby, inviting them to take refreshment (*AP* 9.314 = 17 GP):

Ἑρμῆς τῷδ' ἔστακα παρ' ὄρχατον ἠνεμόεντα
 ἐν τριόδοις πολιᾶς ἐγγύθεν αἰόνος,
 ἀνδράσι κεκμηῶσιν ἔχων ἄμπαυσιν ὁδοῖο·
 ψυχρὸν δ' ἀκραὲς κράνα ὑποϊάχει.

I, Hermes, stand here nearby a windy orchard
 at a crossroads near the grey seashore.

²¹ Relief, Luck (1954: 176); for dedications of herdsmen, see, e.g., Leonidas 47 GP (= *AP* 6.35) and Theocritus 2 GP (= *AP* 6.340); both epigrams discussed in detail below.

²² For this aspect of the epigram see already Elliger's interpretation (1975: 377).

²³ For examples see Elliger (1975: 381–96), Rossi (2001: 40–4), and Bernsdorff (2001: 140–8).

I offer relief from the way to weary men,
the spring pours down pure and cool.

The poem's indirect address to weary passersby (3)²⁴ draws attention to Hermes not only as the ὁδοῦ φύλαξ, as he is called in another epigram of this type (*AP* 10.12.2), but as a source of refreshment to all. Since Hermes is also known as the god of the thieves, there might be a certain ambivalence in this epigram as the wayfarer might feel free to take from the fruits of the orchard. Two other epigrams in the small Anytean corpus with the same five elements—a tree, a spring, the heat of the day, refreshment offered, and wind in various configurations—constitute self-variations (*AP* 9.313 = 16 GP and *AP* 228 = 18 GP).²⁵

Whereas in the last epigram Hermes was clearly the speaker, 16 GP leaves open who beckons the passerby to rest:

ἴζεν ἅπας ὑπὸ καλὰ δάφνας εὐθαλέα φύλλα
ώραίου τ' ἄρυσαι νόματος ἀδὸν πόμα,
ὄφρα τοι ἀσθμαίνοντα πόνοις θέρεος φίλα γυῖα
ἀμπαύσης πνοιῇ τυπτόμενα Ζεφύρου.

Sit down everybody under the laurel's lovely and rich foliage
and take a sweet draught from the nice spring
so that your limbs, exhausted from the labors of summer,
may rest, struck by the breeze of Zephyr.

In the absence of a clear identity for the speaker the reader might be justified in equating the voice with that of the poetess.²⁶

In the next variation, Anyte's innovation is the creation of a dialogue between an inquiring passerby and (a statue of?) Pan who explains his task. Moreover, like the Theodotus epigram this poem evokes not only the rural world but specifically the pastoral realm, which serves to introduce music and singing. Thus for the first time we encounter subjects that would become crucial features of Theocritus' bucolic world (*AP* 231 = 19 GP):

²⁴ For the involvement of the reader in these epigrams see Bing (1995b: 120). There is a similar strategy in Anyte's epigrams.

²⁵ For this type of "Landschaftsepigramm" or "Landschaftsgemälde," see Elliger (1975: 377), who shows the distribution of motifs in these epigrams in a table; cp. Luck (1954: 175–6). Similar is Anyte 15 GP (= *AP* 9.144) on a precinct of Cypris.

²⁶ See Gutzwiller (1998b: 71). The same technique can also be seen in the last epigram of this group, *AP* 228 (= 18 GP), where the stranger is addressed as ξεῖνε at the beginning.

Τίπτε κατ' οἰόβατον, Πὰν ἀγρότα, δάσκιον ὕλαν
 ἤμενος ἀδυβόα τῷδε κρέκεις δόνακι;
 Ὅφρα μοι ἐρσήεντα κατ' οὔρεα ταῦτα νέμονται
 πόρτιες ἡυτόκων δρεπτόμεναι σταχύων.

- Why, rustic Pan, do you sit in a lonesome, shady wood
 playing on this sweet-sounding reed?
 —So that my calves may pasture on these dewy mountains
 and cull the fertile grasses.

Although Pan's music and singing here do not constitute a unifying theme throughout the bucolic epigrams of Anyte, and although ἀδυβόα δόνακι may be understood in a poetological sense (cf. Theocritus 21.2–3 GP = 5.2–3 Gow = *AP* 9.433.2–3), music in this poem plays a different, pragmatic and economic role by contributing to the productivity of the flocks.²⁷

In Anyte's epigrams there are almost no individual people. The shepherd Theodotus is the only exception. Anyte is concerned first of all with the lives of the humble, the simple people of her Arcadian world: caves mentioned in some epigrams are inhabited by flocks and their herders, and a phrase like ἀσθμαίνοντα πόνοις θέρεος in line 3 of epigram 16 GP suggests not only people who suffer from the heat of summer but specifically field laborers who are invited to take a rest. In this way she extends the subject matter of epigram to people who were until then not in the realm of epigrammatic poetry (see Gutzwiller (1998b: 69–70)). As we shall see, Leonidas goes a step further by individualizing the people of a world of which we can catch a first glimpse in the poems of Anyte.

Other poets vary the theme of Anyte's bucolic epigrams. One example may suffice, Nicias of Miletus 5 GP (= *AP* 9.315). It is to this poet that Theocritus dedicated his "Cyclops" and "Hylas":

Ἴζευ ὑπ' αἰγείροισιν, ἐπεὶ κάμες, ἐνθάδ', ὀδίτα,
 καὶ πῖθ' ἄσσον ἰὼν πίδακος ἀμετέρας·
 μνάσαι δὲ κράναν καὶ ἀπόπροθι, ἃν ἐπὶ Γίλλῳ
 Σῖμος ἀποφθιμένῳ παιδί παριδρύεται.

- Sit down here under the poplars, traveller, since you are weary,
 and coming nearer drink from our spring;
 even though you are far away, remember the fountain
 which Simus constructed for Gillus, his dead son.

²⁷ For a similar interpretation, see now Bernsdorff (2001: 144–5).

The opening imperative ἵζευ, together with ὑπ' αἰγείροισιν takes up the invitation to the passerby to rest in Anyte 16.1 GP, while also drawing on the Theodotus poem. Here, too, the dedicator is named, and perhaps we can suppose with Gow-Page (1965: 2.432) that this inscription is similarly written for a relief of the Naiads. But the second couplet opens a new dimension by shifting to the language of grave epigram: the speaker asks the passerby not to forget the dedicator's fountain and his dead son when he is far away. Whereas the epigrams of Anyte show a scene which operates only in the present, Nicias adds the temporal dimensions of the past and the future, Gillus' death and the request not to forget the dedication, respectively.²⁸ In the first two lines of Hermocreon 1 GP (= *AP* 11), a variation of the same theme, respite is again on offer by the speaker, Hermes (cp. Anyte 17 GP). But the epigram's core is no longer hardship and the refreshment offered by the water of the fountain, but Hermes' role as protector of the fields and crops.²⁹

Although Anyte extended the subject matter of epigram to the lower classes, the people of the rural world are not her only interest.³⁰ Leonidas of Tarentum, by contrast, dwells on precisely this point by incorporating lowly people more broadly into his epigrams and by emphasizing the contrasts between rich and poor, simple and refined. More complex than Anyte's, Leonidas' style has often been called baroque,³¹ and the demands of Leonidean development expand his poems beyond Anyte's quatrains. For example, whereas Anyte's passerby is introduced with one word, ξείνος, in the twelve-plus line Leonidas 27 GP (= *AP* 9.316 = 57 Geffcken) this starting-point becomes a richly imagined journey: ὦ τάνδε στείχοντες ἀταρπιτόν, αἶτε ποτ' ἀγροῦς/δαμόθεν αἶτ' ἀπ' ἀγρῶν νεῖσθε ποτ' ἀκρόπολιν, "you all, who are on the way whether you go from the city to the fields or back from the country to the acropolis." Going on, Leonidas uses the dedication as a pretext to

²⁸ See also Elliger (1975: 381–3) for the interpretation of the epigram and the related poem, Nicias 7 GP (= *AP* 188).

²⁹ For the differences between Anyte and Hermocreon, see also Elliger (1975: 383). For further imitations of this epigram type, see, for example, Agathias Scholasticus *AP* 6.79, where the ploughman Stratoniceus addresses Pan and thanks him for his kindness.

³⁰ See, for example, Anyte 9 GP (= *AP* 7.208), where the milieu seems decidedly upper-class.

³¹ See Gutzwiller's remarks (1998b: 89–90) and von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1924: 1.139–44). For the baroque style in contemporary art see Fowler (1989: 32–43).

present a rivalry between the god Hermes, the speaker, and Heracles, both guardians of the frontiers (ὄρων φύλακες δισσοὶ θεοί). Hermes, fearing that the gluttonous Heracles will snatch all the offerings, proposes that his addressee make clear to whom he wants to give his sacrifices. Compared with the simple epigram of Anyte 17 GP, in which Hermes likewise addresses a passerby, the situation is much more complicated, and Leonidas' point has an artificial quality.³² The offer of refreshment and the amenities of the country setting at the heart of Anyte's poems scarcely play any role in the Leonidean epigram.

Although Leonidas alludes to Anyte in some of his epigrams, his perspective and interests remain quite different. No Leonidean epigram describes a landscape; he seems, rather, much more interested in people, especially the lowly of his world. Not only fishermen and herdsman, but also gardeners and hunters belong to the rural world he describes, and these have counterparts from the urban world, such as weavers and carpenters, whom Leonidas details as well. In his epigrams, Leonidas confronts the rural world with that other more urban world whose citizens even include higher-class people.

On a formal level, Leonidas' poems are rather traditional—if somewhat longer than usual—as he writes mainly dedicatory epigrams. A short and structurally simple epigram like *AP* 9.329 (= 6 GP = 55 Geffcken) stands out as an exception. No longer than an Anytean epigram, it presents the prayer of a gardener named Timocles to the Nymphs asking them to water his plots:

Νύμφαι ἐφνδριάδες, Δώρου γένος, ἀρδεύετε
 τοῦτον Τιμοκλέους κᾶπον ἐπεσσύμεναι·
 καὶ γὰρ Τιμοκλῆς ὑμῖν, κόραι, αἰὲν ὁ καπεὺς
 κᾶπων ἐκ τούτων ὄρια δωροφορεῖ.

Nymphs of the water, daughters of the house of the river Dorus,³³
 water this garden of Timocles diligently.

³² See Geffcken in his introduction to the poem (1897: 90): "Versteht es die Dichterin [i.e., Anyte 17 GP], ihrem einfachen Stoffe eine gewisse Lieblichkeit und Unmittelbarkeit zu geben, so kann Leonidas sich nicht genug thun an barockem Putze und neuen Pointen.... Das verschmitzte Motiv der durch Brotneid entzweiten Gottheiten, die doch sonst sich so vielfach berühren, bleibt sehr frostig." Elliger's judgement (1975: 385, n. 15) seems more justifiable.

³³ For Δώρου γένος see the note of Gow-Page (1965: 2.315). Geffcken (1897: 88–9) points out that the Macedonian river Echedoros is also called Dorus in an abbreviated variation.

For Timocles, the gardener, always presents to you, girls,
the fruits of the seasons out of his gardens.

Here we can see that the rural world of Leonidas is not limited to herdsmen. The repetition *κᾶπον...καπεύς...κάπων* may be intended to suggest the simplicity of the gardener.³⁴ Variations of the same theme are Hermocreon 2 GP (= *AP* 9.327),³⁵ which also begins with an address to the *Nymphai ephydriades*, and the anonymous epigram *AP* 9.328 (= 'Damostratus' 1 GP).

Leonidas 81 GP (= *APL* 190 = 47 Geffcken) is also related to Anyte. Here for the first time we find a herdsman dedicating a Herm:

Τᾶν αἰγῶν ὁ νομεὺς Μόρυχος τὸν ἐπίσκοπον Ἑρμῶν
ἔστασ' αἰπολίων εὐδόκιμον φύλακα.
ἀλλὰ μοι αἶ τ' ἄν' ὄρη χλωρᾶς κεκορεσμένοι ὕλας,
τοῦ γ' ἀρπακτῆρος μή τι μέλεσθε λύκου.

Morychus, the herdsman of his goats, set up Hermes here
as a vigilant watchman, famed as a guardian of flocks.³⁶
But you goats, who have fed on the green wood in the mountains,
do not worry about the rapacious wolf.

The statue of Hermes is drawn from its model, Anyte 17 GP (= *AP* 9.314).³⁷ But whereas in Anyte the passerby is invited to rest, here Hermes has a more important task—a task more in accord with the interests of a herdsman: he must guard the flocks against a wolf which could attack them.³⁸

In the Leonidean corpus, there are numerous poems in which lower class people dedicate some of the tools of their trade to a god. In one, *AP* 6.35 (= 47 GP = 80 Geffcken), Teleson, a herdsman and a hunter, dedicates some to Pan:

³⁴ See Gow-Page (1965: 2.315) and Geffcken (1897: 89), who thinks this repetition "not pretty" but seems to accept it as an imitation of the gardener's simple way of speaking.

³⁵ On the problem of ascribing this epigram to the poet Hermocreon see Gow-Page (1965: 2.305–6).

³⁶ For this interpretation of the difficult phrase see Gow-Page *ad locum* (1965: 2.384).

³⁷ See Geffcken (1897: 81) who argues that the epigram depends on Nicias 8 GP (= *APL* 189) and 7 GP (= *APL* 188) and so indirectly from Anyte. For Anyte 17 GP (= *AP* 9.314) as model for this epigram and others see also Gutzwiller (1998b: 316–7).

³⁸ For the role of the god see also Hermocreon 1 GP (= *APL* 11) mentioned above.

τοῦτο χιμαίροβάτῃ Τελέσων αἰγώνυχι Πανί
 τὸ σκύλος ἀγρείης τεῖνε κατὰ πλατάνου
 καὶ τὰν ραιβόκρανον ἐυστόρθυγα κορύναν
 ᾧ πάρος αἰμωποὺς ἐστυφέλιξε λύκους,
 γανλούς τε γλαγοπήγας ἀγωγαῖόν τε κυνάγχαν
 καὶ τὰν εὐρίνων λαίμοπέδαν σκυλάκων.

Teleson hung up this hide for the goat-mounter, the goat-hoofed Pan
 at a plane tree in the field,
 and this club from a fine branch with its crooked head,
 with which he used to beat wolves with bloody eyes,
 and milk-pails for curdling milk and a collar for leading dogs,
 and a leash for keen-scented puppies.

Many words in this epigram are new: αἰμωπούς, γλαγοπήξ, and ἀγωγαῖος are found only in Leonidas. The contrast between the neologisms and the simple objects described is certainly intended. The skin which is dedicated as a first gift to Pan could be, as Gow-Page suggest (1965: 2.356), from one of the wolves the herdsman has warded off and killed with his club. πάρος (4) can be understood in two different ways: either 1) the dedicator means to say that the club he is dedicating has always done good work and, if he now has to do without it, it is really a sacrifice, or 2) Teleson is retiring because of his age, a situation which is explicitly mentioned in other epigrams of this type.³⁹ As in other such dedications, this poem lists the offerings the retiree dedicates to the god who has been propitious to him. Two other epigrams also mention the killing of a wild beast threatening the herds and show that Leonidas was interested, as here, in the hardship and dangers of rural life (*AP* 6.262 = 48 GP = 66 Geffcken, a wolf killed by the shepherd Eualces; *AP* 6.263 = 49 GP = 64 Geffcken, a lion killed by Sosus).⁴⁰

On the other hand, there are also several epigrams depicting people of a higher class. We have already seen that in Leonidas' epigrams there are names of many individuals. Some of these hint at the social status of these figures. In *AP* 9.326 (= 5 GP = 54 Geffcken) Aristocles, in the same role as the weary travellers in Anyte's epigrams, offers his cup in thanks to the Nymphs for their refreshment:

³⁹ See for example *AP* 6.296 (= 50 GP), where Sosippus retires because of his old age.

⁴⁰ Gutzwiller (1998b: 97).

πέτρης ἐκ δισσῆς ψυχρὸν κατεπαλμένον ὕδωρ
 χαίροις καὶ Νυμφέων ποιμενικὰ ξόανα,
 πέτραι τε κρηνέων καὶ ἐν ὕδασι κόσμια ταῦτα
 ὑμέων, ὧ κοῦραι, μυρία τεγγόμενα,
 χαίρετ'. Ἀριστοκλῆς ὅδ' ὁδοιπόρος ᾧ περ ἁπῶσα
 δίψαν βαψάμενος, τοῦτο δίδωμι κέρας.

Cold water coming down from two rocks,
 hail to you, statues of Nymphs, made by herdsmen,
 and to you, rocks, and your thousand little dolls,
 you maidens of the spring, drenched in the waters.
 Hail to you. I, Aristocles, the wayfarer, give you this cup as a gift,
 with which I drove out my thirst when I dipped it into the water.

The epigram, for all its similarity to the Theodotus epigram of Anyte, is in one respect quite different: Aristocles seems to be the name not of a member of the rural world but of a nobleman, and Leonidas emphasizes in his epigram the contrast between herdsmen (ποιμενικὰ ξόανα) and the noble world of the dedicator. In another epigram the dedicator, Neoptolemus the son of Aeacus, is perhaps even a member of a royal family (*AP* 6.334 = 3 GP = 53 Geffcken):

αὔλια καὶ Νυμφέων ἱερὸς πάγος αἴ θ' ὑπὸ πέτρῃ
 πίδακες ἢ θ' ὕδασιν γειτονέουσα πίτυς
 καὶ σὺ τετραγλῶχιν, μηλοσσόε, Μαιάδος Ἑρμῆ,
 ὅς τε τὸν αἰγιβόταν, Πάν, κατέχεις σκόπελον,
 ἴλαοι τὰ ψαιστὰ τό τε σκύφος ἔμπλεον οἴνης
 δέξασθ', Αἰακίδεω δῶρα Νεοπτολέμου.

Grottoes and holy hill of the Nymphs and you, fountains
 beneath the rock, and you, neighbor of the waters, pine,
 and you, protector of the sheep, Hermes, son of Maia, with four angles,
 who you live on the hill climbed by the goats,
 be merciful and take the cakes, the cup full of wine,
 gifts of the son of Aeacus, Neoptolemus.

This Neoptolemus is, as his patronym makes clear, a member of the Epirot royal family. Thus, here again we see dedications to rustic deities by a man of a higher class.⁴¹ Another epigram seems to belong to this group of poems (*AP* 9.744 = 82 GP = 60 Geffcken): Soton and Simalus, not simple goat-herders (αἰγινόμοι), but apparently owners of

⁴¹ Luck (1954: 176) notes the similarity of this epigram with Anyte 3 GP discussed above. But I would emphasize that, unlike in Anyte, Neoptolemus is not a member of the rural world. Gow (1958b: 113–4) is sceptical about the identification of this Neoptolemus with the man who ruled Epirus jointly with Pyrrhus.

the flock, πολύαιγοι (“rich in goats,” 1), dedicate a statue of a he-goat to Hermes, the god who cares for the cheese (τυρεντήρι) and makes milk abound (εὐγλαγι). All these people seem to share with the poor the ideal of a simple life, reflected in the similarity of their offerings. Gutzwiller (1998b: 97–8) argues that the poems concerned with upper-class people were perhaps composed originally for inscriptional purposes and were integrated into the collection of his other epigrams as they share the same values. The upper-class presence might also provide an approach to these poems for literate readers who might more readily identify with the upper class.

A final poem, an *epitymbion* for Cleitagoras (*AP* 7.657 = 19 *GP* = 59 Geffcken), exemplifies Leonidas’ interest in bringing the rural and urban worlds into converse with one another:

ποιμένες, οἱ ταύτην ὄρεος ῥάχιν οἰοπολεῖτε
 αἶγας κευείρους ἐμβοτέοντες ὄις,
 Κλειταγόρῃ πρὸς Γῆς ὀλίγην χάριν, ἀλλὰ προσηνῇ
 τῖνοιτε χθονίης εἵνεκα Φερσεφόνης·
 βληγήσαιντ’ ὄιές μοι, ἐπ’ ἀξέστοιο δὲ ποιμῆν
 πέτρης συρίζοι πρηέα βοσκομέναις,
 εἴαρι δὲ πρῶτῳ λειμώνιον ἄνθος ἀμέρξας
 χωρίτης στεφέτω τύμβον ἐμὸν στεφάνῳ
 καὶ τις ἅπ’ εὐάρνοιο καταχραίνοιτο γάλακτι
 οἴός, ἀμολγαῖον μαστὸν ἀνασχόμενος,
 κρηπὶδ’ ὑγραίνων ἐπιτύμβιον· εἰσὶ θανόντων,
 εἰσὶν ἄμοιβαῖαι κὰν φθιμένοις χάριτες.

Shepherds who roam over the ridge of this mountain
 going with your goats and your fleecy sheep,
 to Cleitagoras, by Earth, do a little kindness, but a nice one,
 for the sake of Persephone underground.
 May the sheep bleat to me, and may the shepherd sitting
 on the rude rock play the syrinx for them when they feed.
 And in early spring may the peasant gather the flowers of the meadow
 and adorn my grave with a garland.
 And may one of you bedew with milk
 from a ewe with many lambs, holding the udder up,
 the base of my tomb. Surely even for the dead there are
 ways to return favors done to the departed.

Some scholars assume that the deceased Cleitagoras is a herdsman who asks his fellow-herdsmen to do him these favors.⁴² Gutzwiller (1998b: 97)

⁴² See Gow-Page (1965: 2.328) and the title given to the epigram by Beckby: “Hirt Kleitagoras” (1957–8: 2.385).

prefers another interpretation proposed already by Labellarte (1969: 41): Cleitagoras is not a rustic but a townsman who has been buried in the country. This seems plausible, as elsewhere Leonidas confronts the rural with the urban world. The interpretation draws further support from the fact that funerary statues were placed along the roads not only at city gates but throughout Attica, as noted by Day (1989: 22). In any case, through the countryside placement of the tomb, Leonidas details the rural world with a warmth which goes beyond his other epigrams. Acoustic aspects of country life are mentioned: the syrinx harmonizes with the bleating of the sheep, whose milk serves also for the libation to Cleitagoras.⁴³ The idyllic tone lends the setting a concord desired by the deceased and reached at least after death.⁴⁴

The urbanity engulfed in an idyllic vision of the rural world in Cleitagoras' *epitymbion* captures an essential point of Leonidas' *oeuvre*. Whereas the typical Hellenistic interest in the lower classes, as in Theocritus, Callimachus, and Herodas, is poetically driven to achieve a juxtaposition of the simple with high art,⁴⁵ for Leonidas the simple rural life celebrates the ideal of modesty under the influence of Cynicism.⁴⁶ Indeed, he even presents himself as a man living a life of poverty, and wandering like a Cynic philosopher.⁴⁷

The collection transmitted under the name of Theocritus comes from the so-called Ambrosian family of manuscripts. This epigram book, obviously compiled by a later editor, is thematically divided into three sections: rural or bucolic epigrams (1–6), dedicatory and sepulchral epigrams (7–16), and epigrams in different metres (17–22).⁴⁸ The sections themselves exhibit a skilful internal arrangement, with thematic links between individual epigrams and a certain progress from poem to poem.⁴⁹ While critics agree that of the six rural epigrams only 1 and

⁴³ For this aspect, now Bernsdorff (2001: 131–2).

⁴⁴ For the urban-bucolic tendencies in the Hellenistic age that can also be observed in the inscribed epigrams see now Bruss (2005b: 48–57).

⁴⁵ See Webster (1964) and Fowler (1989).

⁴⁶ See now Gutzwiller (1998b: 100–8) and Gigante (1971: 45–51).

⁴⁷ Compare *AP* 7.736 (= 33 GP) and Gutzwiller's discussion of the epigrams which have been read also as a reflection on Leonidas' own life and of the epigrams in which the poet names himself (1998b: 107–12).

⁴⁸ Gutzwiller (1998b: 41–5) shows that this arrangement can be interpreted as falling within the tradition of Alexandrian epigram books.

⁴⁹ See Gutzwiller (1998b: 43). Earlier Whitmore tried to interpret these six poems as a whole (1918: 618).

perhaps 3 can be genuine,⁵⁰ it is sufficient to note that these poems were likely ascribed to Theocritus because of their rural character.

Only the first two epigrams of the Theocritean collection are similar in type to those of Anyte and Leonidas, though they differ as well. Both are dedicatory epigrams. In the first, dewy roses and thyme are offered to the Heliconian Muses; thereafter, dark leaves of laurel for Pythian Apollo. We arrive emphatically in the world of herdsmen only at the end of the epigram with the sacrifice of a he-goat, especially the precious detail of its nibbling at the endmost branch of the terebinth. And unlike in Anyte and Leonidas, we don't know who the dedicator is. Gutzwiller (1998b: 43) considers the poem the start of the collection, the dedicated items filling a literary role; functioning thus, the sacrificed goat prepares the way for the next, clearly bucolic, poems.⁵¹

The second epigram (6 GP = AP 6.177) is likewise dedicatory. Here the dedicator's name, Daphnis, provides a link to the bucolics of Theocritus; and the cowherd (and hunter, as his offerings indicate)⁵² appears in this and the three subsequent epigrams. Just as in Leonidas the dedicator offers some of his tools to a god, so here Daphnis in his retirement (πόκα, "once," 4) offers Pan his club, wallet and pipe, as no longer useful. The most important difference from the Leonidean epigrams is that the dedicator is no unknown figure but the "hero" of Theocritus' bucolic poems. Daphnis' surprising "white-skinned" (λευκόχρως) appearance betrays him as a creature of literature unlike his sun-burnt rustic counterparts in the real world. In Arland's view, Daphnis' whiteness renders him an ἐρώμενος, a *puer candidus*,⁵³ which may in turn anticipate the next epigram in which he is hunted by Pan and Priapus. Together, the Theocritean epigrams develop something like a story of Daphnis⁵⁴ and each provides him with a new aspect.

⁵⁰ For the question of genuineness see the discussion in Gow (1950: 2.527), Bernsdorff (2001: 106), and now Rossi (2001), who sees all the bucolic epigrams (2–6) as the work of imitators of Theocritus—for the date of Epp. 2–6 see Rossi (2001: 362). Ep.1 which almost all of the older critics think genuine as *dignum Theocrito* is now rejected by Gutzwiller (1998b: 43) "because it seems unworthy of him." For Ep. 6 see also Whitmore (1918: 619).

⁵¹ For further discussion see Rossi (2001: 121–5), who denies the bucolic character of the epigram.

⁵² See now Rossi (2001: 134–6).

⁵³ Arland (1937: 73); for the problem see now also Rossi (2001: 134).

⁵⁴ Daphnis remains the archetype of beauty, perhaps even rustic beauty, in the later epigrammatic tradition. See for example Meleager 88 GP (= AP 12.128); Eratosthenes Scholasticus AP 6.78 calls Daphnis δῦσερως as in Theocritus' first *Idyll*.

Thus an important new feature is introduced in the third epigram (19 GP = AP 9.338):

εὔδεις φυλλοστρώτι πέδῳ, Δάφνι, σῶμα κεκμακός
 ἀμπαύων, στάλικες δ' ἄρτιπαγεῖς ἀν' ὄρη·
 ἀγρεύει δέ τοι Πάν καὶ ὁ τὸν κροκόεντα Πρίηπος
 κισσὸν ἐφ' ἱμερτῷ κρατὶ καθαπτόμενος,
 ἄντρον ἔσω στείχοντες ὁμόρροθοι. ἀλλὰ τὸ φεῦγε,
 φεῦγε μεθεῖς ὕπνου κῶμα καταγρόμενον.

You sleep, Daphnis, on the leaf-strewn ground,
 resting your weary limbs, and your stakes are lately set up on the hills;
 but Pan is on your track, and Priapus,
 fastening the golden ivy on his comely brow.
 With like intent they come into your cave.
 Nay flee away, cast off the oblivion of sleep and flee.

(trans. Gow, slightly modified)

Daphnis, sleeping in his cave, is warned to flee Pan and Priapus by an “off-stage voice” (Rossi 2001: 142) that, as the next epigram reveals, can be identified with another lover of Daphnis. On vases, too, we find the motif of a goatherd pursued by Pan while a Priapic herm looks on.⁵⁵ The story of Daphnis’ unhappy love for a girl is broadly narrated in Theocritus’ first *Idyll*, and Lycidas in the seventh *Idyll* alludes to the same story. In the epigram the Theocritean situation is reversed: the unhappy lover of the first *Idyll* is now the *eromenos* sought not only by Pan but also by Priapus. With Daphnis a new theme emerges: in a departure from traditional dedicatory epigrams or sepulchral topics, the love theme, absent from Anyte and Leonidas, now takes center stage.

The fourth poem, which given its length can hardly be called an epigram,⁵⁶ takes up this theme, this time the speaker’s love for Daphnis. The poem contains a long descriptive beginning (1–12). The speaker first addresses a nameless goatherd (1; cp. Theocritus, *Id.* 1.12) and gives him directions to a statue of Priapus (1–4).⁵⁷ The sacred enclosure surrounding this statue of the ithyphallic fertility-god is then described as a *locus amoenus* (5–12). The last part of the poem (13–18) instructs the addressee about his prayer. The poem’s beginning plays with the simple form and type of epigram that gives a wayfarer directions; the central

⁵⁵ Thus Gow (1950: 2.529).

⁵⁶ Thus von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf: “neun Disticha, das kann kaum ein hel-lenistisches Epigramm sein” (1906: 199), followed by Kroll (1964: 207). But compare the length of many Leonidean epigrams.

⁵⁷ For the text of lines 3–4 see Bernsdorff (2001: 166–7).

second part, the description of the *locus amoenus*, raises the stylistic level by drawing on other generic traditions such as epic, tragedy, and lyric; the final part returns to the epigrammatic tradition by turning to votive epigram and bucolic poetry.⁵⁸

Though speaking under the pretext of freeing himself from his painful love for Daphnis, the unsuccessful lover—so the last lines—actually seeks help to win Daphnis. If successful, he will sacrifice not only a kid, but also a heifer and a lamb. Thus the love theme is playfully adopted and developed; but this speaker, who still hopes for success, is far removed from Theocritus' unhappy lovers.

Daphnis is also mentioned in the fifth epigram (21 GP = AP 9.433), again in a new role. The speaker of this poem will play the lyre, the addressee the *aulos*, and Daphnis the *syrix*; and this ensemble will rob Pan of his sleep. Imitation of the poems of Theocritus is important for this epigram: the epigram's beginning, λῆξ ποτὶ τῶν Νυμφῶν, alludes to Theocritus' first *Idyll*, where Thyrsis asks the unnamed goatherd to sit down if he wants (12).⁵⁹ The Daphnis who through these four poems dominates the Theocritean bucolic epigrams thus occupies varied roles—as retiring herdsman and musician, as object of desire for Pan, as the speaker's love-interest, and as fellow-musician.

The last epigram of the rural section (22 GP = AP 9.432) features not Daphnis, but Thyrsis. His appearance here, mourning and weeping just as Daphnis in *Id.* 1, is set up by the preceding epigram's allusion to Theocritus.⁶⁰ The reason, however, for Thyrsis' tears is not love, but the death of one of his goats killed by a wolf, a theme of many Leonidean epigrams. In this respect the last of the rural epigrams takes up a new theme, though simultaneously returning to subjects which are more usual within the epigrammatic tradition, if absent from the *Idylls* of Theocritus. The theme of the deceased sheep also provides the link to the next group of Theocritean epigrams, the funeral epigrams. In the rural section, poems with new subjects are thus framed by traditional ones.

⁵⁸ See Rossi (2001: 153–65) and already von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1906: 199–201).

⁵⁹ For Pan's sleep at midday, see lines 15–6 in the same poem. See Bernsdorff's interpretation (2001: 151).

⁶⁰ Thyrsis κομήτης, the villager, also appears in Myrinus 3 GP (= AP 7.703) sleeping while Eros guards his flock. For this epigram see Whitmore (1918: 620) and now Bernsdorff (2001: 152–3). A dedication to Pan in another of the four epigrams we know from Myrinus, 1 GP (= AP 6.108), is a rather traditional bucolic epigram.

The scope of these epigrams is quite different from that of the bucolic epigrams of Anyte and Leonidas, inasmuch as they presuppose the bucolic poems of Theocritus, with which they share numerous motifs. It is striking that the love theme is totally absent from the bucolic epigrams of Anyte and Leonidas although love is important generally for the epigrammatic tradition. Only the Theocritean bucolic epigrams are also influenced by the theme of love. Further, they presuppose Theocritus' bucolic *Idylls* in the names and characters we encounter: we recognize Daphnis and Thyrsis only because we know Theocritus' *Idylls*. Neither Anyte nor Leonidas forge so close a link to a literary model. On the other hand, the bucolic epigrams of Theocritus have only isolated motifs in common with the rest of the tradition of the bucolic epigram.

In the later epigrammatic tradition we also find epitaphs for herdsmen who have died in an accident, such as *AP* 7.174 (7 GP *Garland*) by Erycius, most probably somewhat older than Vergil, on the death of the herdsman Therimachus:

οὐκέτι συρίγγων νόμιον μέλος ἀγχόθι ταύτας
 ἁρμόξῃ βλωθρᾶς, Θηρίμαχε, πλατάνου,
 οὐδέ σευ ἐκ καλάμων κερααὶ βόες ἀδὺ μέλισμα
 δέξονται σκιερᾷ παρ δρυὶ κεκλιμένου.
 ὤλεσε γὰρ πρηστήρ σε κεραύνιος. αἱ δ' ἐπὶ μάνδραν
 ὤπ' ἐβόες νιφετῷ σπερχόμεναι κατέβαν.

No longer near this lofty plane-tree, Therimachus, shall you tune the pipe's pastoral melody, nor shall the horned cattle listen to the sweet song from your reeds as you lie beside the shady oak. A thunderous tempest killed you; and your cattle came down to their fold at nightfall, hurried by the snowstorm.

(trans. Gow-Page (1968: 1.249))

This poem engages such intertexts as its neighbors in *AP*, Mnasalces 8 GP (= *AP* 7.171) and above all Diotimus 10 GP (= *AP* 7.173). In both Erycius and Diotimus, the miserable Therimachus has been killed by lightning. Erycius elaborates on Diotimus by adding the motif of the music-making herdsman whose cattle enjoy his playing, with the exception that in Erycius they will henceforth have to do without. This motif is known already from Anyte 19 GP and Leonidas 19 GP. Erycius uses it here in the same way, i.e., to establish an intimacy between the herdsman and his cattle. We may also detect Theocritus' influence: while the cattle's late return home (6) varies Diotimus 10.1 GP, where the cattle return to the fold alone (αὐτόματα), this in turn alludes to

Theocritus *Id.* 11.12: Polyphemus' sheep often returned home alone (αὐταί) while the love-sick Cyclops stayed at the shore longing for Galatea.⁶¹ Theocritus' influence on Eyrician bucolic epigram is static and limited to details and motifs of the genre, rather than a source for creative elaboration.

Whitmore (1918: 618) found the "the first noteworthy examples" of epigrams "in which the true pastoral spirit becomes manifest" in Anyte's landscape descriptions. He could not, however, accept Reitzenstein's view that these epigrams were "rein bukolisch" (1893: 130). This raises the question of what the term "bucolic" means in relation to the poems of Anyte and Leonidas. Both poets shared with Theocritus an interest in the rural world. But if bucolic is understood in a strict Theocritean sense, then both Anyte's and Leonidas' "bucolic" epigrams are remote from this model. The essence of Anyte's bucolic epigrams is the rest and refreshment that can be given to somebody weary in the summer's heat; for Leonidas it is the idea of simplicity. These poets share Theocritus' interest in the rural world. That applies especially to Anyte, who moved beyond conventional dedicatory epigram to descriptive poems, thereby extending the possibilities of the genre.

It should not surprise us that Whitmore noticed pastoral motifs in the true sense only in the Theocritean epigrams: his standard was derived from these poems and could not accommodate those of Anyte and Leonidas. The collection of Theocritean epigrams is indeed something unique. Not only are its six bucolic poems interrelated, they are also closely linked to Theocritean bucolic *Idylls* by their development of the Daphnis theme. These epigrams reveal that, while other epigrammatists might take rural subjects in different directions, Theocritus' *Idylls* became the template for a particular conception of bucolic in epigram and in other genres.

⁶¹ For further interpretation see now Bernsdorff (2001: 119–20 and 147–8).

SATIRIC EPIGRAM

Gideon Nisbet

Book 11 of the *AP* largely consists of a type of epigram called “skoptic.” Within the larger project of the *AP*, book 11 is unusually uneven in its construction and presents textual archaeologists with knotty difficulties.¹ On a more hopeful note, it is also unusual in the level of helpful (if potentially misleading) paratext supplied by the anthologist. Cephalas’ information on skoptic epigram may well go as far back as the Second Sophistic (mid-first to third centuries A.D.) and the generations after the *Garland* of Philip—that is, to the very period at which this odd sub-genre of epigram suddenly and surprisingly attained literary (or, less kindly, sub-literary) prominence.² Whether or not Cephalas is “right” about skoptic epigram, his editorial remarks are significant insofar as no extant classical author discusses the form. *AP* 11, then, is not simply our principal source for skoptic epigram: it is, inescapably, also our yardstick. As a more or less unified corpus, it is as solid a basis as we are ever likely to get for modelling and theorizing skoptic epigram, its readerships, genealogies, motifs, repertoires and wider points of reference—from the mid-first century A.D. onwards, at least.

What is “skoptic,” though—or, more particularly, “skoptic epigram”?³ Within the context of epigram as genre, and especially given the long-term dominance which the Latin poet Martial would come to exercise over epigram’s future history as a Western literary form, it has always made good sense to translate the Greek term as “satirical” or “satiric.” Good enough sense, at least; but it bears stating at the outset that our

¹ The near-obsessively intricate Cameron (1993) is the closest we are ever likely to get to an authoritative account of the *GA*’s textual prehistory. On *AP* 11 see Cameron (1993: 84–6); briefly and inconclusively, Nisbet (2003a: 1–2).

² I am inclined to push for a Second Sophistic origin for the section prefaces of *AP* 11 on stylistic grounds, but my optimism could easily be misplaced; see Nisbet (2003a: 21–5).

³ The Greek σκώπτειν, σκῶμμα and related forms long predate skoptic epigram’s Roman-era heyday, and their field of reference is correspondingly fairly broad. Our readiness to fix on “satire” as a straightforward translation when “skoptic” meets “epigram” bears witness to the teleological power of Martial in reception.

understanding of skoptic epigram and of *AP* 11 is, knowingly or not, predicated upon successive receptions of Martial. These receptions have in turn been conditioned by older reading strategies which have taken the Latin epigrammatist's Great-Author poses pretty much at face value, discarding potential irony and satirical hamming (not to mention plain old-fashioned fibbing) to produce, with reverential hindsight, a paradigmatic Compleat Epigrammatist: the self-generating point of departure and stand-alone authority figure for a whole Western tradition in witty light verse.⁴ If Martial is a Great Author, disdaining even to mention his occasional borrowings from the Greeks, then the Greeks in question must be strictly secondary—to be read in his terms, and by definition at a disadvantage. Even the earlier, negative modern readings of Martial helped underwrite an essentially equivalent reading strategy. The crudities of the skoptic epigrammatists marked them out as the degenerate and inattentive heirs of Hellenistic epigram's flower-like delicacy, corrupted by loutish Rome's foul-mouthed satirists. The very presence of "satiric" point was symptomatic; the "best" (that is, earliest) Greek epigram had never needed such showy luxuries. Later Greek epigram had fallen from a Simonidean state of grace, abandoning the pristine simplicity of the morally improving Hellas so favored by Victorian proselytizers for the classics. Martial had led these naughty schoolboys into bad habits.⁵

⁴ Martial's critical rehabilitation is primarily associated with Sullivan (1991)—still very useful, despite its dated assumptions.

⁵ This still current (and indeed mainstream) critical assumption is essentially Victorian, from a time when carefully vetted selections from the *Anthology* were frequently used as school texts. Representative is the aesthete John Addington Symonds' *Studies of the Greek Poets* (1893: 2.314): "In Lucillius the Hellenic muse has deigned for once to assume the Roman toga, and to show that if she chose, she could rival the hoarse-throated satirists of the empire on their own ground. But she has abandoned her lofty eminence, and descended to a lower level." Much read in its time, *Studies* went through numerous editions and impressions. Cf. the painstakingly issue-dodging Neaves, published under the Reverend W. Lucas Collins' "Ancient Classics for English Readers" imprint (1893: 14): "The true or the best form of early Greek epigram does not aim at wit or seek to produce surprise." Rapturously received, Collins' affordable series aimed to improve schoolboys and working men alike via a selective exposure to uplifting classical writers. Simonidean "simplicity" (specified as "noble," "massive," "high," etc.) was an article of faith for a generation of popularizing critics including Jebb and Mackail. More recently, Amy Richlin's Martial-centric feminist critique of Lucillius' and Nicarchus' crude misogyny has given the thesis a shot in the arm: Richlin (2002: 47–9, 128–31). The modern scholarship routinely and understandably classifies skoptic epigram as "satirical"; see, e.g., the indices to Cameron (1993) and to the standard modern monograph on the Hellenistic epigrammatists, Gutzwiller (1998b).

These underlying assumptions are still relatively widespread, not often explicitly interrogated, and necessarily distorting to a degree. Oddly enough, however, they need not fatally compromise our understanding of the main *AP* 11 authors. (Their most damaging effects have instead been in the field of Martial scholarship.) Instead, and strangely, an interpretative paradigm fraught with unreflective circularity turns out to serve tolerably well, at least up to a point. For Martial himself is significantly indebted to the skoptic epigram of the mid-first century onwards, written by poets who just missed the deadline for inclusion in Philip's *Garland*.⁶ Martial did not pick them as models simply because they were contemporaries; instead he found advantage in their approach to genre, which was in many ways quite unlike anything epigram had seen before.⁷ He owes a particularly substantial debt to the author whose output dominates *AP* 11, Lucillius. Lucillius' contemporary and imitator Nicarchus also exercises a strong influence. Many individual borrowings have been traced by a small but serviceable body of preliminary scholarship, opening up much potential for more methodologically lively work in future—and indeed for more list-building, although even the approximate extent of Martial's literary indebtedness is set to remain unquantifiable given the disordered and potentially distorting character of *AP* 11 as our source for Lucillius and Nicarchus.⁸ That Martial remains insistently in denial about his Greek models makes the relationship if anything more interesting in terms of possible reading strategies. (His ham-fisted attempts at faking up a ring-fenced Latin literary pedigree are red flags to a genre-aware readership—I would argue, by design.)⁹ The relationship has certainly had its positive outcomes in twentieth-century scholarship, if only at the purely tactical

⁶ Lucillius is, like Philip, Neronian in date. Philip may in any case have had his own reasons as a literary collector and critic for ignoring emergent trends in contemporary epigram.

⁷ On first-century skoptic epigram's break with previous practice see, briefly, Cameron (1993: 15–16), and more generally Nisbet (2003a); and cf., enjoyably, Bowersock (1994: 22–4, 34–5).

⁸ Useful groundwork is established by Burnikel (1980) and, in passing, Sullivan (1991: 86–7). A handful of epigrams by Lucillius and Nicarchus do pop up in other books of the *GA*, but vagaries of attribution combine with provenance/context issues to compromise the potential value of these poems for modelling skoptic epigram. Nonetheless, exemplary one-offs like Lucillius' own book 2 proem, *AP* 9.572, clearly deserve attention; Nisbet (2003a: 36–47).

⁹ I touch on one example in my other chapter in this volume on Roman receptions of Hellenistic epigram, and hope to say more in a future publication.

level of market share; the skoptic poets' assumed role of warm-up act to the famous big-city satirist has kept them in the critical eye more often than not. It has also been modestly successful in attracting a casual wider readership via accessible modern translations which play up skoptic epigram's more palatably "satiric" aspects—wit, invective, point and paradox—at the expense of others which modern readers might well have found tiresome.¹⁰

Things, then, are looking up for post-Philip skoptic epigram in spite of Martial's corrupting influence—and even, for the adventurous, because of it. But what are we to make of skoptic epigram in the generations leading up to Philip's *Garland*? The absence of Martial as a stalking horse and foreordained end-product should make it easier to read Philip's authors without one level at least of distorting preconception. At the same time, extending our study of skoptic epigram backwards beyond Lucillius runs us straight into a mess of interpretative issues which may well prove intractable. Previous scholarship on Hellenistic skoptic epigram—not a busy field, to say the least—has made what headway it has by putting these issues on hold.¹¹ But what does it mean to say that an epigram by (say) Callimachus is a "skoptic epigram"? Are we meant to read it in a different way? What kind(s) of cultural frame should we invoke? *AP* 11's section prefaces make large claims for skoptic epigram as a long-standing sympotiac staple, but Cephala carefully hedges issues of period and continuity:

πολλὴ κατὰ τὸν βίον τῶν σκωπτικῶν ἐπιγραμμάτων ἡ χρῆσις· φιλεῖ γάρ πως ἄνθρωπος ἢ αὐτὸς εἰς τινὰς παίζειν ἢ πρὸς τοὺς πλησίον ἀποσκώπτοντος ἀκούειν, διὰ τῶν ἐξῆς τοῖς παλαιοῖς γινόμενον ἐπιδείξομεν.

The applicability of skoptic epigram throughout life is considerable. It is human nature to enjoy making fun of other people, or listening to a person mocking their peers. And I think that we will be able to demonstrate by the following material that this was the case among the ancients.

τὸ συμποτικὸν εἶδος ἐκ σκωμμάτων σύγκειται καὶ συμβουλῆς τῶν παλαιῶν ἀεὶ παρὰ τὸν πότον ἀλλήλους ἀποσχεδιαζόντων...

The sympotic form consists of skoptic material and advice from the ancients, who were always improvising at one another over drinks...

¹⁰ In particular, its frequently sententious ethical and dietetic advice. On skoptic seriocomic elements versus the translators' tendency to "satire-ize" see Nisbet (2006).

¹¹ See primarily Blomqvist (1998). The basic but useful discussion by Gutzwiller (1998b: 170–82) of Hedylus is similarly brisk in sweeping methodological qualms under the carpet.

Cephalas' claims here are superficially plausible, and may well be correct, although this does not entail that he has a reliable source for these statements, or even that they are written by him; Cephalas is a great recycler. Modern scholarship on epigram tends to accept a symptotic connection for epigram generally, and skoptic activity is linked to the symposium in ancient literary descriptions from at least the early Hellenistic period.¹² However, no extant source before Cephalas links epigram to skoptic activity at symposia, or even names skoptic epigram as a category—a silence that speaks ever greater volumes as our repertoire of known categories expands. Even if we leave aside the open and fraught question of the prefaces' authorship, dating and sources (if any) of information, we are left with the more fundamental puzzle of genres and contexts. Is there such a thing as skoptic epigram in the third century B.C., or the second, or the first—really, at any time up to and including Philip?

One provocative solution might be to suggest that there *is* such a thing—but only in retrospect, incrementally generated via successive receptions. The broad dynamic I am suggesting here is one of reconfiguration, and I would tentatively identify two main processes.

First, individual epigrams are reconfigured as skoptic by re-reading in the light of other epigrams already placed (more or less provisionally, and on whatever basis) in a skoptic category. This model patterns *AP* 11 in its present form as the end product of a snowball effect. Once a few Hellenistic epigrams (and especially epigrams by big-name authors) are being read within an interpretative frame generated by Martial's Greek models and their first- and second-century successors, the identification of a widening range of Hellenistic epigrams as skoptic becomes progressively more straightforward and indeed "obvious."

Second—and the overlap and interplay between these two posited processes is immediately obvious—we have the cut-and-paste activities of textual users and producers (itself another instantly blurred distinction) across a wide literary and sub-literary field. These activities range from the *ad hoc* compilation of private commonplace-books to substantial published editions, collections and florilegia.

Whether at the level of the individual poem, the single named author, or the diverse hands and products of a large-scale anthology—and

¹² A symptotic context for epigram is assertively articulated by Cameron (1995). On discussions of skoptic activity at symposia in Plutarch and Hellenistic symptotic elegy see Nisbet (2003a: 25–8).

whether reading or writing—these twinned processes encourage the incremental reconfiguration of epigram(s) as “skoptic” via successive thematic prioritization. Simultaneously, I suggest, they encourage a progressive narrowing down of “skoptic” as a descriptor of epigram to a particular implicit sense or set of senses, reflecting priorities initially set up by—or subsequently read into—the sub-genre’s first-century pioneers. Epigrams by Hellenistic authors, by this model, *become* skoptic epigrams via expropriation, retrofitting and shifts in context: same lines, different poem. In formalist terms, the individual epigram becomes a different aesthetic object.¹³

Of course, this has demonstrably happened to some of these epigrams on at least one prior occasion. We do find *Garland* poets represented in *AP* 11, and the epigrams in question certainly did not fall under the heading of the “skoptic” in the collections of Meleager and Philip.¹⁴ Nor, in turn, did epigrams which these earlier collectors placed under the category heading of, e.g., “erotic” or “epideictic” necessarily carry that identity prior to the compilation of the *Garlands*. As a virtuoso discussion of Callimachus 15 GP (= *AP* 5.146 = 51 Pf.) has pointed out, the *Garlands* are “precisely the point at which the trail gets cold” when we try to work backwards to Hellenistic practice.¹⁵

Consider, for instance, Hedyllus 11 GP (= *AP* 11.123) on a bad doctor:

Ἄγῃς Ἀρισταγόρην οὐτ’ ἔκλυσεν, οὐτ’ ἔθιγ’ αὐτοῦ.
 ἀλλ’ ὅσον εἰσῆλθεν, κῶχεν Ἀρισταγόρης.
 ποῦ τοίην ἀκόνιτος ἔχει φύσιν; ὦ σοροπηγοί,
 Ἄγιν καὶ μίτραις βάλλετε καὶ στεφάνοις.

Agis didn’t give Aristagoras an enema; he didn’t even lay a hand on him. As soon as he arrived, though, Aristagoras departed. Where’s the poison that has such natural power? You coffin-makers, shower Agis with chaplets and garlands.

¹³ The classic discussion of the aesthetic object, still tremendously valuable, is Mukarovsky (1970).

¹⁴ If only because Philip did not use the standard and very user-friendly Hellenistic apparatus of categories and headings. Instead, in an idiosyncratic development of Meleager’s model, he arranged poems first by initial letter and then, within each letter-group, with an eye to thematic resonance and/or contrast. This manufactured opportunity to parade his editorial discrimination and his talent at flower arranging is of course rather inconvenient for our purposes. For a methodical and lucid account of Philip’s scheme, accounting for the surviving traces in the *GA*, see Cameron (1993: 33–41).

¹⁵ Petrovic and Petrovic (2003: 186), a valuable article.

This epigram by a poet of the third century B.C. reaches Cephalas via a chain of transmission which includes Meleager's *Garland*. Hedylus' poem—or a poem imitating it, or a poem imitated by it—is closely echoed in five poems by Callicter, an epigrammatist of unknown date but probably writing in the Second Sophistic (*AP* 11.118–122); five by Lucillius' imitator Nicarchus, writing in the mid- to late first century A.D. (*AP* 11.112–16); and one by Strato, writing under Hadrian (*AP* 11.117). There are two additional anonymous epigrams included by Cephalas in the same thematic category (*AP* 11.125–6), again probably Imperial in date. This “family” of epigrams points back towards either Hedylus' poem or one very like it, but the trail has indeed gone cold. What happens now is up to us, and none of our options really satisfies. We can summarily declare Hedylus' poem to be, at least, contingently skoptic insofar as it closely resembles these other epigrams; or we can cast around for alternative descriptions, all too aware that we will forever be denied interpretative closure. A minimal explanation might be that Hedylus' poem playfully conflates two standard Hellenistic categories, the funerary epigram (for Aristagoras) and the epigram inscribed on the statue of a victorious athlete (for Agis); but this says next to nothing about the unknowable sub-generic codes under which the poem operated within its now irretrievably lost first publication context. It says still less about the range of headings under which it may have travelled both before and after Meleager. The epigram's status as aesthetic object has been transformed beyond recall by successive imitation and variation, the very dynamics which give epigram its vitality as a genre and which have fuelled most of the conventional modern scholarship.¹⁶ Ancient anthologists locate the “original” against categories formed by its “copies,” and we follow their lead.¹⁷

Other models of course remain available; it would be an extreme (if theoretically tenable) position to argue that every pre-Lucillian epigram in *AP* 11 must be written off in this way as only contingently skoptic. It could easily be the case that Callimachus would have instantly known what we meant by “skoptic epigram,” and would promptly

¹⁶ The obvious example is Tarán (1979); but a “family”-based approach also underlies, e.g., Gutzwiller (1998b).

¹⁷ Petrovic and Petrovic (2003: 186–7): “For a compiler of an anthology, the chronological development of the epigram was irrelevant, since the epigrams were not classified chronologically, or according to author, but thematically. Thus, the compiler would have a bulk of epigrams of various authors from different times, and would arrange and re-arrange them solely on the grounds of their textual features.”

have directed our attention to a headed “skoptic” category in one of his books of epigrams.¹⁸ The evidence does not offer this model any support, but then again, the evidence is very patchy. What is more, *ex silentio* arguments stand revealed as obvious hostages to fortune in the present critical climate. The discovery of the Milan Posidippus has overturned older theories about the sorts of literary epigram written in the Hellenistic era—theories which, reasonably enough, reflected the material then available via the *GA*. We are now in a position to say that Hellenistic authors would have found nothing intrinsically strange in the *idea* of “skoptic epigrams” as a potential heading for a category within a published book; some of the section headings of the Milan papyrus make it look positively mainstream. Philip’s own silence on skoptic epigram proves nothing; he fashions his identity as an anthologist and textual critic precisely by making distinctive creative choices about the shape of his collection and the inclusion and categorization of particular poems.

AP 11’s prose prefaces offer a tempting model of an established Hellenistic sympotic context for skoptic epigram—not just occasional “skoptic epigrams,” but an entire cultural/literary practice and implicitly perhaps a full-fledged terminology and critical discourse. However, we should not take this as an excuse to stop theorizing Hellenistic skoptic epigram, whether the prefaces are “right” or not—and we will never really be able to say for sure. (My own inclination is to read them as authentically Second Sophistic, but as disingenuous in their claim to report earlier practice—at best, they represent a good guess.)¹⁹ If the expropriation model is right, even if only in part, then an anti-methodological approach makes a perverse and back-to-front sense. One might as well just exercise fiat as critic-*cum*-connoisseur and state that particular favorites just are skoptic—because we say so. If we confine ourselves (as I think we must) to epigrams contained in *AP* 11 then the

¹⁸ The evidence for Hellenistic books of epigram being arranged by thematic category is now very solid, with the Milan Posidippus clinching an already persuasive critical consensus: see now the *editio minor*, Austin and Bastianini (2002). The odds are high that skoptic epigram in the Imperial era routinely followed earlier practice, albeit with one significant modification. The key evidence is P.Oxy. LXVI 4502, a column from a Nicarchan book. Its thematic coherence supports the idea of organization by category, but the scribe also precedes each poem with a heading which specifies the topic; cf. n. 29, below.

¹⁹ Again, see Nisbet (2003a: 21–5).

credibility-sapping dogmatism is even done for us, by Cephalas and/or an indeterminate number of cut-and-pasting forebears. So why is this not an ideal solution? Why not just read *AP* 11 against a flattened-out and undifferentiated (or, by my preferred account, actively de-differentiated) interpretative background? But this defeatist approach ends in solipsistic absurdity: why not also add to *AP* 11 at our whim, pasting in epigrams which we fancy as witty—regardless of provenance, or, indeed, of whether they’re really “epigrams” at all? (Epigram as what happens when scissors meet elegy, or any extended verse form; and if it doesn’t make perfect sense, all the more reason to read it as a “joke.”)²⁰

Most readers would rightly shy away from this. Questions of genealogy and broader cultural contexts are consistently to the fore in modern discussions of ancient genres, none more so than epigram. *AP* 11’s eclectic pleasures are an alluring incentive to abandon context, but we need to keep irony-quotes firmly in mind (if not necessarily always on the page) if we are to develop a satisfying account of “Hellenistic skoptic epigram.”

Such an account must, I suggest, begin by temporarily postponing detailed engagement with the Hellenistic content of *AP* 11, fine and witty though much of it surely is. If some (perhaps many, conceivably all) Hellenistic skoptic epigrams only come under the sign of the skoptic via expropriation and contextual shifts, then to read them within the *GA*’s frame is already to prioritize a derivative reading over a lost “original.”²¹ The book’s organizational scheme, incomplete though it is, clearly indicates that successive excerptors and compilers often missed

²⁰ We may note in passing that many modern translations of the “*Greek Anthology*” pursue just this path, enlisting mixed Greek and Latin verse excerpts ranging from Archilochus to the *Carmina Burana*. I hope to examine this phenomenon in a subsequent publication. For a fleshed-out and highly intriguing reverse version of my gambit here, see Thomas (2004). Thomas productively re-examines Horace *Odes* 1.28, Propertius 3.7 and two episodes in Virgil’s *Aeneid* in the light of the new Milan papyrus. The Horatian *Ode* in particular is read as an archly reflexive mimesis-cum-dramatization of cultural translation and expropriation. Thomas reads Horace as presenting a simulation of a thematic sequence or headed category lifted out of a Posidippus-style epigram-book, trimmed of explanatory paratext, and re-figured under the new Roman sign of discursive short elegy. On “fragmenting” longer verse forms into epigram, cf. my remarks on Archilochus’ “shield” fragment, Nisbet (2003a: 14–15).

²¹ My irony-quotes here reflect any number of necessarily elided cruxes of sympotic performance, rewriting for publication and so on—on which, for a strong if self-consciously maverick account, see Cameron (1995: 71–103). For a counter-argument to Cameron, see Bing (2001).

the joke. Additionally, their ideas of what constitutes a joke may not work for us—or for the individual epigrams in their (now of course irrecoverable) original published contexts.²²

With the Milan Posidippus, at a stroke, our model of Hellenistic epigram's thematic range has been radically expanded, even exploded. This particular book never had a "skoptic" category—with the tenuous exception of *Tropoi*, on which I will say a little more later—but we cannot rule out the possibility that some others did. This possibility had not previously seemed to merit serious consideration; it is now in play, but must remain provisional while we wait for another papyrological miracle.

More concrete and productive would be the analysis of reflexive and indeed playful intratextuality²³ within the Milan papyrus for which Kathryn Gutzwiller has laid such useful groundwork. Significant verbal repetition across epigrams in notionally distinct categories is one obvious marker of this phenomenon; another is *mise-en-abîme*, particularly evident in Posidippus' epigrams on intricately inscribed gems, which is sensibly read as reflexive on the poet's own procedures. Gutzwiller has little to say on humor in epigram, but her provisional conclusion offers a generously fruitful point of departure for subsequent scholarship:

I suspect in the end the most exciting discovery will be the way in which the collection as a whole creates meaning from the interrelationship of its epigrams.²⁴

These new readings of Posidippus align the study of Hellenistic epigram with current scholarship on Martial, where ambitious and reflexive intratextuality is beginning to emerge as an important characteristic of the corpus.²⁵

²² We might expect erratic or lackluster readings of minor authors and one-off entries in *AP* 11, but glaring misapprehensions (evident in flawed categorization) are evident for significant skoptic poets too; see Cameron (1993: 87–8) and particularly Nisbet (2003a: 138–42, 155–8, 161–4) on Ammianus *AP* 11.97 and the "Stratonikeion," both responding to Robert (1968: 283). Scholarship on humor is often notably humor-deficient, and the same might perhaps be said by extension of textual editing and compilation; see the stimulatingly mischievous discussion by Eco (1990: 163–4).

²³ On intratextuality generally see Sharrock and Morales (2000).

²⁴ Gutzwiller (2004a: 93).

²⁵ Boyle (1995: 96): "each book of the *Epigrams* is an interactive semiotic system." Lorenz (2004: 276): "I would like to note for the record that the proper frame of reference for exploration of the poems is really the dodecapartite whole." On persona and Martial's extended metapoetics, see Roman (2001).

Peter Bing is one scholar who has taken up the challenge of what we might loosely (and wishfully) term “skoptic” intratextuality within the Milan text. He finds jokes emerging from the pattern of interrelationships introduced by Gutzwiller’s account via an astute deployment of classic Reader Response theory. Soses of Cos is miraculously cured in one epigram (97 AB, in the category headed “cures”), only for us to come across his epitaph (103 AB) in a subsequent section, *Tropoi* or “turns” (102–9 AB). The name of this previously unattested Posidippian category is provisionally and non-exclusively glossed by Bing as ironic twists of fate: “it is hard retrospectively not to find humor in the previous poem.”²⁶ But the intended sense of the heading remains obscure. Is a *tropos* a (potentially humorous) “variation” or “version” of a stock theme; or a stock “character-type,” as developed by Theophrastus in his *Characters* and exploited by Lucillius? Ideally I would wish to read *tropoi* not as twists of fate, but as twists in the tail—paradoxical reversals of scenarios or expectations set up by poems earlier in the book, as per Bing’s example. However, the text offers no firm support to any of these readings. All of the epigrams in the section are funerary. With the exception of Soses, it is hard to see what distinguishes them from the epigrams of the earlier section of the roll headed *Epitymbia*, “Epitaphs” (42–61 AB). Despite some intriguing parallels of detail, the *Tropoi* fail to pan out as a workable genealogy for skoptic epigram.²⁷

Nonetheless, intratextuality as a pervasive structuring device within a single-author book of epigrams should give us pause for thought. Readers of epigram in its Hellenistic heyday are clearly primed to expect a book to offer complex implicit patterning, hidden beneath the apparently plain and unassuming surface structure of categories and headings. This trend is, I suggest, drastically curtailed in post-Philip skoptic epigram. Traces of interrelations between individual epigrams by a single author survive (surely against the odds) even into *AP* 11—but on rare occasions, and only with major skoptic poets. Even then, the functional unit is very basic. What we find is linked pairs of epigrams that demand to be read as pairs, the first poem in each case supplying the interpretative cues necessary for a successful reading of the second. Some of these pairs could in theory be part of longer sequences, but it

²⁶ Bing (2004: 287).

²⁷ Obbink (2004b: 294–301) explores a range of possible meanings for *tropos*, and points to parallels of rhetorical phrasing (295–6) which incidentally link the Milan Posidippus to Lucillius.

appears significant that so many identifiable pairs have survived and no sequences of three.²⁸ They may reflect the symposium's favored performative dynamic of call and response; equally, and perhaps additionally, they can be read as a wry acknowledgement of the skoptic authors' own secondary status as latecomers to a by now backward-looking genre.²⁹ That these poems stood as pairs in the authors' published books is clear from Martial, who clearly imitates Lucillius' practice in this area as in others.³⁰ Lucillian skoptic epigram represented a new departure in many ways. I have suggested elsewhere that the new sub-genre is relatively downmarket (if not quite "popular"). It may have been more directly geared towards use at contemporary symposia than were the more established forms of epigram which, by this period, were perhaps being read within a more squarely "literary" interpretative frame—in large part, I think, because of the work of anthologists like Philip in canon-formation.³¹

Intratextuality was clearly still part of the generic package for skoptic epigrammatists of the first century A.D. and beyond, then, but probably at a residual and perfunctory level. It is (and will probably remain) impossible to rule out pervasive intratextuality at the level of the published single-author book, but the currently available evidence indicates only the very basic device of linked pairs. Lucillius' Latin imitator Martial uses paired epigrams in imitation of Lucillius, but at a larger structural level he makes a clean break both from skoptic epigram and from Greek epigram generally, abandoning organization by category. We might even suggest that Lucillius' insistent use and reuse of stock comic names is a kind of running joke against the very idea of workable and meaningful intratextuality. Diophantus: *leptos*, astrologer, shipowner, invalid? Marcus: athlete, short stuff, *leptos*, doctor, poet,

²⁸ Burnikel (1980: 88–95) on matched pairs in Lucillius. On pairings and intratextual sequencing in Ammianus, where it may survive only because of editorial laziness, see Nisbet (2003a: 136–8, 145–6, 152–3).

²⁹ On pairs of epigrams in the Hellenistic period see Kirstein (2002). I am tempted to read Lucillius' use of pairs as a humorous acknowledgement that he has missed the boat; matched pairs are a feature not of the original single-author books of epigram's Hellenistic heyday, but of the anthologists who had subsequently re-packaged it for the Western Tradition. Specifically, Meleager arranges by matched pair, some of which he creates by juxtaposing an "original" and a "copy": Gutzwiller (1998b: 277–8). Cf. perhaps the pseudo-anthologizing epigram headings in the Nicarchan P.Oxy. LXVI 4502 (n. 18 above).

³⁰ On Martial's use of pairs see Scherf (1998).

³¹ Nisbet (2003a: 25–35).

orator, hunter, lazy guy? Attempts to make Lucillian names work as “evidence” always fall flat, in no small part because Lucillius playfully subverts our desire to draw out connections by actively destabilizing these most obvious of intratextual cues.³²

On balance, it appears probable that the Hellenistic poets whose epigrams find their way into *AP* 11 were more ambitious and sophisticated in organizational terms than the skoptic epigrammatists proper of the early centuries A.D. If this is so, then it follows that much more has been lost by their expropriation from original publication contexts than is the case with Lucillius and his imitators.³³ Even if individual poems were originally categorized as skoptic by their Hellenistic authors, and are correctly read within a skoptic interpretative frame, we may at times be getting only half the joke.

Perhaps the pre-Lucillian content of *AP* 11 works best when the writers already have excerption more or less in mind. Use at symposia is one such case, and I have suggested that skoptic epigram perhaps continued to direct itself towards sympotic performance in ways that types of epigram with a more elevated literary pedigree did not. But one much clearer and stronger case is available: Philip himself, five of whose epigrams are preserved in *AP* 11. Cephalas places two of these, 58 and 59 *GP Garland* (= *AP* 11.33 and 36) in the sympotic section of the book. Of the three that are categorized as skoptic, one two-line epigram, 80 *GP Garland* (= *AP* 11.173) criticizes the behavior of a miser; it has been appended to a sequence of epigrams on misers which is probably built around a Lucillian frame.³⁴ The epigram is a good match to the rest of the sequence in terms of treatment. Its critique carries a strong advisory slant which in turn reinforces the idea of sympotic use.³⁵ The remaining two epigrams (*AP* 11.321 = Philip 60 *GP Garland* and *AP* 11.347 = Philip 61 *GP Garland*) are longer, and are explicitly metapoetic. This emphasis may reflect Philip’s own priorities as a textual scholar—or a later compiler’s ideas of what those priorities should have been. What is clear is that subsequent skoptic epigram responds

³² Diophantus: *AP* 11.103, 111, 114, 245, 257. Marcus: *AP* 11.85, 90, 93, 94, 113, 135, 143, 194, 276, 277, 312. For discussion, see Nisbet (2003a: 98–101).

³³ Adding to the interpretative irony, Cephalas gives us extended sequences of (non-intratextual) Lucillian epigrams—and not even short sequences of Hellenistic authors.

³⁴ *AP* 11.165–73; Lucillian epigrams open and close the sequence (165, 171, 172). Two concurrent epigrams by Nicarchus are included, 11.169–70; these too may derive from a published sequence in a single-author book.

³⁵ Nisbet (2006).

to Philip's poems, repeatedly and in detail. I discuss here the shorter of the two epigrams, 61 GP *Garland*:

χαίροιθ' οἱ περὶ κόσμον ἀεὶ πεπλανηκότες ὄμμα
οἱ τ' ἀπ' Ἀριστάρχου σῆτες ἀκανθολόγοι·
ποῖ γὰρ ἐμοὶ ζητεῖν τίνας ἔδραμεν ἥλιος οἴμους
καὶ τίνοσ' ἦν Πρωτεύς καὶ τίς ὁ Πυγμαλίων;
γινώσκοιμ' ὅσα λευκὸν ἔχει στίχον· ἡ δὲ μέλαινα
ἱστορίῃ τήκοι τοὺς Περικαλλιμάχους.

Goodbye, you who are always scanning the universe with your eyes, and you too, thorn-collecting book-moths of the School of Aristarchus. For why should I care what orbits the sun followed, and whose son Proteus was, and who Pygmalion was? Let me know only those things which find expression in clear writing; but let inky studiousness wither the Callimachus groupies.

Key *AP* 11 authors respond to Philip's epigram via creative variation. Most broadly, and surely with Philip more or less in mind, the Hadrianic epigrammatist Pollianus leaves a series of literary-critical skoptic epigrams which seem to have been his distinctive specialization (*AP* 11.127, 128, and particularly 11.130). The last of these three poems name-drops Callimachus and his imitators, probably in allusion to Philip; but, love him or loathe him, "Callimachus" is in any case indispensable epigrammatic shorthand for flagging a position-statement on literary values.³⁶

τοὺς κυκλίους τούτους, τοὺς 'αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα' λέγοντας,
μισῶ, λωποδύτας ἀλλοτρίων ἐπέων.
καὶ διὰ τοῦτ' ἐλέγοις προσέχω πλέον· οὐδὲν ἔχω γὰρ
Παρθενίου κλέπτειν ἢ πάλι Καλλιμάχου.
'Θηρὶ μὲν οὐατόεντι' γενοίμην, εἴ ποτε γράψω,
εἵκελος, 'ἐκ ποταμῶν χλωρὰ χελιδόνια.'
οἱ δ' οὕτως τὸν Ὅμηρον ἀναιδῶς λωποδυτοῦσιν
ὥστε γράφειν ἤδη 'μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά.'

Those Cycle poets, the ones who keep saying "And next"—I hate those clothes-thieves of others' hexameters. And that's the reason I tend towards elegy instead: for there's nothing I can steal from Parthenius or Callimachus. May I become a "long-eared brute" if I ever write "green celandine from the rivers." But they steal Homer's clothes so shamelessly that their poems start with "Sing, Goddess, the wrath."

³⁶ On Pollianus *AP* 11.130 see Nisbet (2003a: 188–93).

Lucillius responds in more detail, borrowing Philip's Aristarchus for a critique of *grammatikoi* as tedious, anti-skoptic fellow symposiasts (*AP* 11.140):

τούτοις τοῖς παρὰ δεῖπνον ᾠδομάχοις λογολέσχαις,
τοῖς ἀπ' Ἀριστάρχου γραμματολικριφίσιν,
οἷς οὐ σκῶμμα λέγειν, οὐ πεῖν φίλον, ἀλλ' ἀνάκεινται
νηπυτιεύόμενοι Νέστορι καὶ Πριάμῳ,
μή με βάλης κατὰ λέξιν 'ἔλωρ καὶ κύρμα γενέσθαι.'
σήμερον οὐ δειπνῶ 'μήνιν ἄειδε θεά.'

Those poem-polemicists and word-wranglers at the dinner-table, those oblique nitpickers of Aristarchus' line—the ones who don't like to crack a joke or have a drink, but lie there playing infantile games with Nestor and Priam—don't toss me to them “to be,” and I quote, “their prey and spoil.” I'm not dining on “Sing, Goddess, the wrath” today.

Distinctive narrative moves are also creatively reworked, again primarily by Lucillius. The sarcastic rhetorical question with which the narrating persona dismissively denies any interest in mythic trivia, *ποῖ γὰρ ἐμοὶ ζητεῖν*, is reworked in an epigram by Lucillius (*AP* 11.141); there it is transformed into a rejection of the clichéd historical exempla of an orator's declamatory education. The Lucillian epigram works very well by itself, but gains additional savor for a readership familiar with Philip's material:

Χοιρίδιον καὶ βοῦν ἀπολώλεκα, καὶ μίαν αἶγα,
ὧν χάριν εἴληφας μισθάριον, Μενέκλεις·
οὔτε δέ μοι κοινόν τι πρὸς Ὀθρυάδαν γεγένηται,
οὔτ' ἀπάγω κλέπτας τοὺς ἀπὸ Θερμοπυλῶν·
ἀλλὰ πρὸς Εὐτυχίδην ἔχομεν κρίσιν· ὥστε τί ποιεῖ
ἐνθάδε μοι Ξέρξης καὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι;
πλὴν κάμου μνήσθητι νόμου χάριν, ἢ μέγα κράζω·
'Ἄλλα λέγει Μενεκλῆς, ἄλλα τὸ χοιρίδιον.'

I've lost a piglet, an ox and a goat, Meneclēs, and it's for their sake that you've received your fee; my situation has nothing to do with Othryades, and I'm not bringing theft charges against the Heroes of Thermopylae. My case is against Eutychides, so what are Xerxes and the Spartans doing in it? Make some passing mention of me for form's sake, or I'll make an objection: “Meneclēs is saying one thing, but my piglet tells another story.”

More widely, and again perhaps in imitation of Philip, Lucillius develops a taste for sarcastic off-the-cuff mythic comparisons; he makes

particularly vile use of them in denigrating women.³⁷ So, too, with dismissive (and epigrammatically concise) generalizations: Philip's οἱ...οὔτ' probably underlies a Lucillian epigram attacking astrologers, *AP* 11.160, where the formulation is πάντες ὅσοι; taken in conjunction, the same poem's ὄψομαι οὐ μακρὰν also loosely echoes Philip's γινώσκουμ'. The confrontational tone is similar, although again Lucillius has shifted the emphasis away from well-read metapoetics towards a stock comic target. Both Lucillius and (especially) Nicarchus inherit Philip's fondness for exuberant linguistic inventiveness; some of their versions are stunningly scatological, but just as often their formulations closely resemble Philip's.³⁸ Philip hopes that late-night literary studies will "wither" the nerdish Callimacheans; Lucillius writes reams of epigrams about these withered intellectuals, the so-called *leptoi*.³⁹

Philip's epigram, then, feeds into post-*Garland* skoptic epigram in sometimes unexpected ways. His other, slightly longer variant, *AP* 11.321 (= 60 *GP Garland*), is just as retrospectively enmeshed in what follows as is *AP* 11.347 (= 61 *GP Garland*).⁴⁰ But—and the point bears repeated emphasis—none of this is intended by the text. Instead it looks backwards to narrowly Hellenistic literary concerns, the stereotypical themes of prose treatises and didactic epics: natural science and epic genealogy. Even features which one might otherwise read as proto-Lucillian turn out to be embedded in the imitative discourse of late Hellenistic literary epigram; Philip's inventiveness is not all that it seems.⁴¹

If we wish, we can still choose to read Philip's epigram, and others like it, through a filter of wishful teleology: as "skoptic," like Lucillius; or, in the usual translations and via the standard reference works, as "satirical" (like Martial?). The poems do after all display striking points of contact with the post-*Garland* explosion of skoptic epigram; but what

³⁷ E.g., Lucillius *AP* 11.196, 11.239; cf. Nicarchus *AP* 11.71, 11.328. See briefly Nisbet (2003a: 80–1).

³⁸ To Philip's apt description of pedantic scholars as ἀκανθολόγοι, cf. particularly Lucillius *AP* 11.140, αἰδομάχοις λογολέσχαις...γραμματολκίριψιν; cf. also, e.g., *AP* 11.134, μακροφλυαρητήν; Nicarchus *AP* 11.110, λεπτεπιλεπτότερος.

³⁹ See particularly *AP* 11.91–5; on *leptoi* as skoptic type and moral panic, Nisbet (2003b).

⁴⁰ Note, for instance, how Lucillius' *grammatikoi* at *AP* 11.142 are fixated on rare forms in exactly the same way as the ones in Philip's epigram, right down to the dismissive use of σφόν by the narrating persona.

⁴¹ ἀκανθολόγος is not a hapax; Philip shares it with Antipater 20 *GP Garland* (= *AP* 11.20). Similarly, his use of σῆς for "bookworm" (literally, "book-moth") is shared by Antiphanes 9 *GP Garland* (= *AP* 11.322).

came after them is none of their business, and they diverge strikingly too. Most of the pre-Philip epigrams in *AP* 11 are a much less good fit to their new context than are Philip's own: e.g., Callimachus 59 GP (*AP* 11.362 = 59 Pf.), or the very first poem in the skoptic section of *AP* 11, Parmenion 13 GP *Garland* (= *AP* 11.65). More to the point, each originally set out to pursue a slightly different path through genre. We can no longer see the tracks they left as intelligible wholes; the *GA* instead preserves a multitude of isolated footprints, transplanted capriciously from a hundred lost trails. Like Crusoe, we find ourselves construing the image of a Friday. The difference is that, confronted by a mass of footprints at once, we risk misunderstanding them as a continuous path whose direction conveniently tallies with their find-spots. None of our Fridays chose to set foot upon this beach. Philip's book-moths are as good a reminder as any that they had other destinations in mind.

PART FOUR

EPIGRAMS AND THEIR INTERTEXTS

ONE THING LEADS (BACK) TO ANOTHER
ALLUSION AND THE INVENTION OF TRADITION
IN HELLENISTIC EPIGRAMS

Alexander Sens

I

The evocation of the literary past is, in one form or another, a feature of Greek poetry of many genres and ages, but was specially marked and intense in the Hellenistic period. Indeed, one defining feature of the compositions of Greek poets of this age was their persistent attention to and engagement with prior texts. At least in part because of their primacy in the canon (and the Greek education system) as a whole and in the philological work performed at the Alexandrian Museum more particularly, the Homeric poems were a special source of interest to writers of the period.¹ Not surprisingly, therefore, the ways in which these works were evoked and manipulated have been a focus of much scholarly work over the last several generations. But the Ionian epics were hardly the only models on which Hellenistic poets drew. Indeed, one of the most interesting and striking features of epigram as a genre is the persistence with which its practitioners engage with their own generic forebears. This paper examines some instances of allusion in Hellenistic epigram. In it I make no attempt to offer either a theory of allusion in general or a typology that accounts for all cases in which Hellenistic epigrammatists drew on their predecessors, both near and remote;² instead I offer a small series of case studies intended to help illustrate some of the richness of allusion in Hellenistic epigram.³

¹ See Harder and Sistakou in this volume.

² For theoretical and typological discussion of allusion in ancient Greek and Roman texts, see, e.g., Conte (1986); Hinds (1998); Pucci (1998); Thomas (1999); Edmunds (2001). A half century ago, Pfeiffer (1955: 72) expressed the hope for an all-encompassing typology of Homeric reminiscences in Hellenistic poetry; much work has been done, but that goal continues to recede.

³ In many cases, it seems clear that a given author deliberately evokes an earlier text in order to create a specific effect that can be plausibly described. Since the 1970s, scholars have intermittently expressed anxiety about authorial intention; cf., e.g., the

Although broad generalizations are necessarily problematic, some of the persistent, almost obsessive, allusiveness of Hellenistic poetry was facilitated and encouraged by the fact that writers of this period knew the works of the archaic and classical past only as written documents from which they stood at an unbridgeable distance, with little access to the performance contexts in which they were produced. In this sense, as recent scholarship has emphasized, Hellenistic poets' engagement with earlier texts was fundamentally a process of "archaeology," in which they reconstructed, selectively and sometimes tendentiously, their own direct literary heritage, while also forging a series of connections to formal and thematic elements belonging to other literary genres and original performance contexts.⁴ For these writers, allusion was, among other things, an etiological instrument, a vehicle by which they could write themselves into a continuum stretching into the remote past (in both cultural and temporal terms), thereby implying the stability of the tradition while simultaneously demonstrating their own creativity.⁵

This etiological impulse is clearly evident in Hellenistic literary epigram. In expanding what had once been a form with the pragmatic function of marking graves and recording dedications to include a broader range of themes, the first generations of Hellenistic poets had few if any direct ancestors. This may help explain why so many Hellenistic epigrams were spuriously assigned to Simonides of Ceos, the earlier poet whose name was most closely associated with epigrams written for actual inscription. It is not always clear how individual poems came wrongly to be assigned to a particular author, but the impulse to assign epigrams to Simonides, whether through forgery or mistaken identification, may reflect a desire to find (or emphasize the existence of) an authoritative, archaic ancestor for the sort of short compositions Hellenistic writers were producing.⁶ This same consideration is relevant

useful discussion in Conte (1986: 23–31). In the case of Hellenistic poetry (the study of which has not displayed this anxiety to same extent that the study of allusion in Roman poetry has), there are so many instances in which the meaning of a passage can plausibly be argued to depend on a specific transformation of a particular antecedent that the onus lies on those who would doubt our ability to access, at least to some extent, authorial intent. See Hinds (1998: 48) on modern scholarly concern with the problem of authorial intent.

⁴ Cf. especially Hunter (1996); Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004).

⁵ For a discussion of allusion as etiology, see Greene (1982: 16–9 and *passim*).

⁶ On the so-called *Sylloge Simonidea*, which has been thought to have developed around a collection organized as early as the fifth century, see Argentieri (1998: 3); Gutzwiller (1998b: 50–3); Bravi (2005); and Sider in this volume.

for evaluating the large number of epigrams pseudonymously ascribed to archaic and classical lyric (including Archilochus, Anacreon, Sappho, Bacchylides) and dramatic poets,⁷ or to poets that Hellenistic writers treated as stylistic ancestors (like Erinna).⁸ In attributing epigrams to these authors, Hellenistic epigrammatists provided themselves with authoritative generic ancestors.

Allusion can function in a similar way, in the sense that a poet's reuse of a particular passage activates the reader's awareness of an entire tradition, thus locating the alluding text in a continuous literary line while treating the target as a poetic ancestor. In this sense, allusion in Hellenistic epigram often functions dialectically. On the one hand, the evocation of a specific model creates meaning in its new context; on the other, it implicitly comments on the model itself. All of this is complicated in the case of epigrams by the fact that these poems were compiled in poetry-books, including both *libelli* composed and organized by a single author and anthologies of multiple poets' work, to which, as in Meleager's *Garland*, an editor might juxtapose his own compositions.⁹ In the first case, the grouping of poems by type or theme could provide a conspicuous generic template against which readers evaluate the interrelationships among individual poems.¹⁰ But it is in the case of an anthology like Meleager's *Garland*, in which the epigrammatist places his own compositions alongside the work of his predecessors, that the impulse to establish and comment on one's epigrammatic pedigree is most vivid: in juxtaposing his own compositions with epigrams on which they are based, the poet lays before the reader his own literary genealogy.¹¹ The question of the position and function of individual epigrams within the collections in which they appeared has received

⁷ For Hellenistic forgeries ascribed to archaic and classical poets, see Page (1981: 127).

⁸ On the epigrams attributed to Erinna, cf. Neri (1996: 195–210) and (2003: 84–8); Murray and Rowland in this volume.

⁹ For Hellenistic and pre-Hellenistic epigram books, cf. Gutzwiller (1998b); Argentieri (1998); Krevans in this volume.

¹⁰ A related sort of engagement between epigrams that seems likely to have been facilitated by the existence of both texts within a poetry-book may be found in pairs of epigrams by a single poet that demand to be read against one another, with the individual poems either contributing jointly to a single continuous story or illuminating one another through parallelisms and contrasts; cf., e.g., the formulation by Kirstein (2002: 117).

¹¹ For Meleager's collection, see Cameron (1993: 19–33); Gutzwiller (1997b) and (1998b: esp. 276–322); Guichard (2000).

attention in recent years, most extensively by Gutzwiller (1998b). That issue, however, lies beyond the scope of this chapter, except insofar as it is worth observing that interconnections among poems within a single collection would have thrust themselves on the reader's attention and thus carried a different expectation of erudition than poems looking to texts not immediately at hand. In what follows, I will consider in detail three poems that engage with the work of other authors—the first two looking most directly to Homeric epic, the third primarily to other epigrams—in order to cast light on the ways in which epigrammatists used allusion to lay claim to a particular place in literary history.

II

An epigram of Antipater of Sidon 58 GP (= *AP* 7.713) honors the poetry of Erinna:¹²

παυροεπὴς Ἑριννα καὶ οὐ πολὺμυθος ἀοιδαῖς,
 ἀλλ' ἔλαχεν Μούσας τοῦτο τὸ βαιὸν ἔπος.
 τοιγάρτοι μνήμης οὐκ ἤμβροτεν οὐδὲ μελαίνης
 νυκτὸς ὑπὸ σκιερῇ κωλύεται πτέρυγι·
 αἱ δ' ἀναρίθμητοι νεαρῶν σωρηδὸν ἀοιδῶν
 μυριάδες λήθῃ, ξεῖνε, μαραινόμεθα.
 λωίτερος κύκνου μικρὸς θρόος ἢ ἐκ κολοιῶν
 κρωγμὸς ἐν εἰαρινᾷς κινδάμενος νεφέλαις.

Erinna used few words and not many themes in her songs,
 but this small epic got its share of the Muses.¹³
 Therefore she did not miss out on fame, nor is she
 curtailed beneath the dark wing of night.
 But we countless throngs of recent poets
 perish without glory in a heap, stranger.
 The small sound of the swan is better than the cawing of
 jackdaws as it is scattered in the spring clouds.

Erinna, the author of a short dactylic hexameter poem known as the *Distaff* (*SH* 400–2),¹⁴ seems to have been much admired by Hellenistic

¹² For the production of epigrams on famous poets as way to signal the author's place in a literary tradition, see Bing (1988b) and (1988a: 50–90); Gutzwiller (1998b: 259–65).

¹³ Uncertainty about the syntax of the verse (cf. Gow-Page (1965: 2.80)) does not materially affect the argument that follows.

¹⁴ See now Neri (2003).

poets, and the treatment of her verse as the small sound of a swan that is to be preferred to the cawing of jackdaws resembles the famous contrast drawn by Callimachus between his own poetry, which he treats as the chirping of a cicada, and the work of his rivals, which he compares to the braying of an ass (*Aet.* fr. 1.29–30 Pf.).¹⁵ Indeed, Antipater's poem belongs to a series of epigrams that contrast the small size of Erinna's *oeuvre* with its great power, a theme that traces back ultimately to Asclepiades 28 GP (= *AP* 7.11):¹⁶

ὁ γλυκὺς Ἡρίννης¹⁷ οὗτος πόνοτος, οὐχὶ πολὺς μὲν,
ὥς ἂν παρθενικῶς ἐννεακαιδεκέτευς,
ἀλλ' ἐτέρων πολλῶν δυνατώτερος· εἰ δ' Αἴδας μοι
μὴ ταχὺς ἦλθε, τίς ἂν ταλίκον ἔσχ' ὄνομα;

This is the sweet labor of Erinna, not great in size—
since it is that of a nineteen-year-old girl—
but more powerful than that of many others. If Hades had not come
for me early, who would have had so great a name?

Whereas Asclepiades treats the small scope of Erinna's poetic output as a function of her early death rather than of deliberate stylistic choice, leaving unstated the qualities that made it more "powerful" than that of others, Antipater turns the limited quantity of her work into a more overt symbol for a particular literary program—that is, for the sort of careful and concise use of language that is a hallmark of "Callimacheanism."

But while the theme of Antipater's poem derives from a Hellenistic predecessor, its language looks back to Homer. The first verse recalls a passage from the Teichoscopia of *Iliad* 3, where Antenor compares the speaking styles of Menelaus and Odysseus on the occasion of their embassy to Troy in quest of Helen (*Il.* 3.213–23):

ἦτοι μὲν Μενέλαος ἐπιτροχάδην ἀγόρευε,
παῦρα μὲν ἀλλὰ μάλα λιγέως, ἐπεὶ οὐ πολὺμυθος
οὐδ' ἀφαιμαρτοεπής· ἦ καὶ γένει ὕστερος ἦεν.
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ πολύμητις ἀναΐξειεν Ὀδυσσεύς,

¹⁵ For the alleged fondness that Callimachus' adherents had for Erinna, cf. Antiphanes 9 GP *Garland* (= *AP* 11.322).

¹⁶ On this poem, see Sens (2003); Neri (2003: 187–9).

¹⁷ Neri (1996: 115–20) has persuasively argued that the original form of the poet's name was aspirated, and that the rough breathing was lost under the influence of the tradition that associated her with Lesbos. I use the conventional nomenclature in English.

στάσκεν, ὑπαὶ δὲ ἴδεσκε κατὰ χθονὸς ὄμματα πήξας,
 σκῆπτρον δ' οὐτ' ὀπίσω οὔτε προπρηγὲς ἐνώμα,
 ἀλλ' ἀστεμφὲς ἔχεσκεν αἰδρεῖ φωτὶ ἐοικώς·
 φαίης κε ζάκοτόν τε τιν' ἔμμεναι ἄφρονά τ' αὐτως.
 ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ὅπα τε μέγαλιν ἐκ στήθεος εἶη
 καὶ ἔπεα νιφάδεσσιν ἐοικότα χειμερίησιν,
 οὐκ ἂν ἔπειτ' Ὀδυσῆϊ γ' ἐρίσσειε βροτὸς ἄλλος.

In fact Menelaus spoke fluently,
 only a few words, but very clearly, since he was not a man of many
 words
 or one to miss the mark in his speaking. He was younger by birth.
 But when crafty Odysseus darted up,
 he held it there, and he looked down, fixing his eyes on the ground.
 And he moved the scepter neither backwards nor forward
 but he stood unmoving like an ignorant man.
 You would have said that he was merely an angry and foolish man.
 But when he sent forth his great voice from his chest
 and words like the winter snows,
 then no mortal would contend with Odysseus.

The opening line of Antipater's poem is clearly based on *Il.* 3.214–5,¹⁸ with the collocation *παυροεπής... οὐ πολύμυθος* echoing the Homeric *παῦρα... οὐ πολύμυθος*, and the novel (and otherwise unattested) coinage *παυροεπής* formed through the overlaying of the first element of verse 214 onto the form of the adjective *ἀφαρμαρτοεπής* (itself attested elsewhere only in the lexicographers) in the first half of 215. Indeed, the second verse, whatever its precise syntax, may itself be read as an expansion of *οὐδ' ἀφαρμαρτοεπής*. The poet thus picks up and develops a stylistic contrast already present in Homer: Erinna's verse has the qualities of Menelaus' speaking style, in which a few carefully chosen words are delivered with clarity. The allusion invites readers to see the poetry of Erinna's rivals as analogous to Odysseus' louder (*μεγάλιν ὅπα*) and more abundant style, and the treatment of their poetry as the cawing of jackdaws as it scatters in the spring clouds evokes Antenor's description of Odysseus, who sends forth words (*ἔπεα*) "resembling the winter snow" (*νιφάδεσσιν... χειμερίησιν*), in the ensuing lines of the Homeric passage.¹⁹

¹⁸ Cf. Conti Bizzarro (2001: 103–4).

¹⁹ In this case, however, the allusion involves verbal variation: *νεφέλαις* evokes *νιφάδεσσιν* by sound but has a different sense ("clouds" as opposed to "snow"), while the adjective *εἰαριναῖς* ("spring") may be read as a typically Hellenistic reversal of the Homeric adjective *χειμερίησιν* ("winter").

Thus the Homeric comparison of Menelaus and Odysseus frames the opposition between Erinna and the numerous anonymous poets with no claim to lasting glory. Although critics have tried to distinguish between *παυροεπής* and *οὐ πολύμυθος* by suggesting that the latter means “having few themes,” the precise significance of these words is less important than the fact that the elements *παυρ-* and *οὐ πολύμυθος* trigger the reminiscence of the larger context in which they originally occur. Inasmuch as these lexical items forge a link between Erinna and Menelaus, they activate for readers the other characteristics of Menelaus’ speaking style, with the implication that Erinna possessed the same clarity (*λιγέως*) and verbal care (*οὐδ’ ἀφαιμαρτοεπής*). The allusion thus ascribes to Erinna qualities that were seen as hallmarks of refined verse by Alexandrian poets—for whom the adjective *λιγύς*, at least, was a loaded, programmatic term that connoted the refined approach of their own work (cf. Callimachus, *Aet.* fr. 1.29 Pf. *λιγὸν ἦχον*). At the same time, the epigram amounts to a reinterpretation of the Homeric passage, in that Odysseus’ speaking-style, which in Homer is treated with admiration by Antenor, becomes by analogy a precursor to the long-winded and ineffective compositions of the poets to whom Erinna is compared.

But Antipater’s use of the Homeric passage as a template for framing the contrast between Erinna and other less accomplished but more copious poetry also serves a broader programmatic function. The poem describes Erinna’s short work as an *epos* (which is to say a poem in dactylic hexameter, the meter that defines epic as a genre), and thus directly situates her poetry in a tradition that traces back to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. At least one other Hellenistic epigram on Erinna, in fact, explicitly associates her work with Homer. The anonymous epigram 38 *FGE* (= *AP* 9.190), a composition that both alludes to Asclepiades’ epigram on Erinna (cf. 4: *τῆς καὶ παρθενικῆς ἐννεακαϊδεκέτευς*) and resembles Antipater’s in the structure of its opening couplet (cf. *μικρὸν / ἀλλ’ ὅλον ἐκ Μουσέων κιρνάμενον μέλιτι*, “small, but completely mixed with honey from the Muses” ~ *παυροεπής... καὶ οὐ πολύμυθος... / ἀλλ’ ἔλαχεν Μούσας τοῦτο τὸ βαιὸν ἔπος*), makes the startling assertion that Erinna’s “three hundred verses are equal to Homer” (3: *οἱ δὲ τριακόσιοι τούτης στίχοι ἴσοι Ὅμηρῳ*).²⁰ In a subtle way, Antipater’s

²⁰ Erinna and Homer are also linked by Eust. p. 1498.37–7 (= Erinna T 16c Neri).

poem achieves a similar effect through allusion. By making a Homeric passage the model for his treatment of Erinna, the poet forges a link between the poetry of his honorand and the *Iliad*, and in so doing implies continuity between one aspect, at least, of Homer's martial epics and Erinna's "domestic" epos.

Another passage of the epigram may further this link. The second half of Antipater's epigram comes as a surprise, inasmuch as it reveals that although the poem seemed initially to be spoken by an anonymous third-person narrator, the speaking voice is in fact that of the numberless throng of poets who perish without lasting recognition. The third couplet opposes the experience of those poets, who claim that they die "in a heap" (σωρηδόν), with the assertion in the preceding couplet that Erinna "did not miss out on fame" (3: μνήμης...οὐκ ἥμβροτεν). In that phrase the key word μνήμη is ambiguous, since it encompasses both the broad sense "memory" and the concrete sense "memorial record," a sense in which it may be used of epigrams (cf. Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1361a34 "μνήμῃ in meter and in prose"). The phrase μνήμης οὐκ ἥμβροτεν may thus be taken as self-referential; Erinna's μνήμη consists of Antipater's poem itself. On this reading, the claim made by the speaking voice of the epigram that other poets die in a heap may be understood to mean that they do not receive the benefit of an individual memorial—ironically enough, since they are the purported speakers of an epigram playing on the form of funerary inscriptions (cf. 6, ξεῖνε). At the same time, it has been suggested that the statement that, unlike Erinna, countless other poets "perish in a heap" recalls Leonidas 30.3 GP (= AP 9.24.3),²¹ where the poet comments on the vast superiority of Homer to other poets by reference to the heavens: as the sun outshines the stars and the moon, so did Homer "plunge poets into obscurity in flocks" (ὑμνοπόλους δ' ἀγέληδὸν ἀπημάλδυνεν Ὀμηρος). Like his predecessor Leonidas, Antipater uses a rare and unusual adverb terminating in -ηδόν and connoting in essence "in a large group" to depict the multitudes of poets outstripped by his honorand. And although the verbal similarity by itself is slight, the combination of morphological, semantic, and contextual points of contact is sufficient to encourage us to read one passage against the other, and thus to identify Erinna's poetic superiority with Homer's.²²

²¹ Gabathuler (1937: 101); Neri (2003: 200).

²² Neri (2003: 200).

The reminiscence of Leonidas thus forms part of a larger matrix of allusion that renders Erinna analogous, in both the nature and the success of her work, to the premier poet of the Greek canon. Antipater's epigram, in other words, associates its own origin and poetic values with the beginnings of Greek literature.

Antipater's epigram may also be understood as a self-referential comment on his own project, inasmuch as its praise of the power and posthumous glory of a poet working on a small scale has obvious relevance to epigram as a literary form. The poem, like Asclepiades' and other epigrams, thus lays claim to Erinna as a stylistic predecessor, and in this sense there may be some playful irony in the speaker's claim that "we countless throngs of younger poets perish without glory"; to the extent that readers are invited to take the first-person plural as including the poet himself, the speaker's self-deprecation is perhaps not to be taken too seriously. The Homeric background of the epigram encourages readers to see Erinna's brevity and precision as the product of deliberate stylistic choice rather than mere biographical accident (contra Asclepiades 28.1–2 GP), and it is particularly significant that Antipater does not frame this preference for brevity as an opposition to the grandest of all Greek poets but instead sets it in a continuous tradition that traces back to Homer. At the same time, by drawing pointedly on Homer to praise Erinna, Antipater affiliates his own poetic endeavor with the canonically fundamental Homeric texts.

III

Not surprisingly, Homeric epic endures as a powerful point of comparison for the form throughout the history of epigram. A good example may be found, several generations after Antipater of Sidon, in a poem by Antipater of Thessalonica (4 GP *Garland* = *AP* 9.517) that has as its central theme the power of music, and thus by implication of poetry:

Ὅρφευς θήρας ἔπειθε, σὺ δ' Ὀρφέα· Φοῖβος ἐνῖκα
τὸν Φρύγα, σοὶ δ' εἵκει μελπομένῳ, Γλάφυρε,
οὔνομα καὶ τέχνης καὶ σώματος· οὐ κεν Ἀθήνη
ἔρριπεν λωτοὺς τοῖα μελιζομένη
οἶα σύ, ποικιλοτερπές· ἀφυπνώσαι κεν ἀκούων
αὐτὸς Πασιθέης Ὑπνος ἐν ἀγκαλίσιν.

Orpheus used to persuade beasts, but you persuade Orpheus; Phoebus
 conquered
 the Phrygian but yields to you when you play, Glaphyrus—
 the word is both your name and a description of your art. Athena would
 not
 have thrown away her pipes if she played
 music such as you do, pleasing and varied as it is. Hearing you,
 Sleep himself, in the arms of Pasithea, would renounce sleep.

In the first part of this poem, the speaker claims that the piper Glaphyrus²³ is more powerful and skilled than the divine (or semi-divine) musicians Orpheus and Apollo, as well as the would-be musician Athena (who rejected the double pipes but would not have done so had she played as well as Glaphyrus). The last figure mentioned in the poem, however, has no connection to music; Sleep, we are told, would wake from slumber in the arms of Pasithea if he heard Glaphyrus play. This final shift of course is unexpected and surprising, given what has preceded, and invites readers to consider its larger significance.

As commentators have observed, the final verse of the poem involves a reference to a specific Homeric scene. In *Iliad* 14, Hera asks the god Sleep to cause Zeus to fall asleep (236–7), promising, after some resistance on his part, that she will give him one of the Graces as his wife in exchange (267–8). Sleep responds with a request for a specific Grace, Pasithea, whom, he says, he has always desired (275–6). Thus Antipater imagines a mythological moment posterior to the events of *Iliad* 14: Sleep has fulfilled his duty, received Pasithea as his reward, and now lies asleep in her arms. Antipater thus places Sleep in a position similar to that occupied by Zeus after Sleep has worked his effect on him: at *Il.* 14. 353, Zeus sleeps, “tamed by sleep and lovemaking, and he held his wife in his arms” (ὕπνῳ καὶ φιλότῃτι δαμείς, ἔχε δ’ ἀγκᾶς ἄκοιτιν). Despite the differences—in Antipater’s poem, Sleep is represented as lying in the arms of his wife, whereas in Homer, Zeus holds Hera in his arms—the reminiscence of the Homeric language (ἔχε δ’ ἀγκᾶς ~ ἐν ἀγκάλισιν) serves to confirm the literary genealogy. That Antipater evokes this Homeric scene in describing its aftermath calls attention to his position as successor to Homer.

This fact is relevant for making sense of the somewhat surprising inclusion of Sleep among the mythical musicians who serve as points

²³ For the question of his identity, see Argentieri (2003: 38, n. 32). The same musician is mentioned at Antipater of Thessalonica 108 GP *Garland* (= *AP* 9.266).

of comparison to Glaphyrus at the beginning of the epigram. Sleep in the *Iliad* is able to overcome the most powerful of the Olympians, and the fact that in Antipater's poem he is represented as having successfully performed his task and won his prize makes him a fitting analogue to Glaphyrus, who in the opening couplet is said to have mastery even over musicians like Orpheus and Apollo. Read against this backdrop, the poem's claims about the effect Glaphyrus' music would have on Sleep contribute to a larger encomiastic claim. As A.S.F. Gow has noted, the verb ἀφουρνόω has the basic sense "wake up" here, but with Sleep as its subject it also implies "would renounce his name,"²⁴ i.e., "would give up his role as Sleep." Understood in this sense, the point of the final couplet is similar to that of the first: as Orpheus (who controls beasts) and Apollo yield to Glaphyrus, so too would Sleep, the god who was able to control even Zeus in the *Iliad*, yield to him.

An important aspect of Antipater's poem is the implicit contrast it sets up between different types of music. Orpheus and Apollo play the cithara (e.g., Hes. *Th.* 95; *h.Ap.* 131; Call. *h.* 2.19; A.R. 1.495, 540), the instrument also associated with the performance of epic poetry as it is represented in the Homeric poems themselves (*Od.* 1.53, 59; 8.248; cf. *Il.* 9.186, where Achilles plays the *phorminx* as he sings the κλέα ἄνδρῶν).²⁵ The first couplet of the poem thus asserts the superiority of Glaphyrus' skill on double pipes (an expertise that, we are told in the central couplet, would have inhibited Athena from rejecting the instrument) to the music of the archetypal mythical citharodes. Read against this background, the specific reference to the *Iliad* in the final lines of the poem may be understood in terms of genre: Antipater's poem sets his own interest in Glaphyrus and his music against the subject matter of Homeric poetry; and Glaphyrus' imagined power even over Sleep, here represented in terms that recall his role in the *Iliad*, suggests by analogy the power of epigram as a literary form.²⁶

²⁴ Gow (1966: 9), who suggests the more specific implication "renounced his conjugal duties;" so also Gow-Page (1968: 2.25).

²⁵ In Homer, the terms *kitharis* and *phorminx* are used interchangeably of the same instrument; cf. West (1992) 50.

²⁶ Given that the poem, like most Hellenistic epigrams, is written in elegiac couplets, it may be significant that the *aulos* was the instrument associated with the performance of archaic elegiac verse; see Thgn. 239–43; Bowie (1986: 14); West (1992: 25).

IV

The etiological impulse that links epigram to Homer and to other archaic and classical literature is also apparent in the numerous instances in which epigrammatists rework language and themes they found in epigrams by other poets. In such cases, the engagement with generic forebears (however proximate they may have been in time and space) is particularly marked. The special force of allusion within a given genre is evident from other Hellenistic literary forms: Apollonius' use of Homer, for example, is in a fundamental sense different from his use of other literature (Euripides' *Medea*, for instance), as is Callimachus' programmatic engagement with Hipponax in the *Iambi*, since in these cases the poet uses allusion to situate his work in a continuous generic tradition that stems from the archaic Greek past. As noted above, the earliest composers of literary epigrams—of epigrams, in other words, whose composers deliberately signalled their own authorship—had few identifiable generic ancestors, since the majority of the authors of the funerary and dedicatory poems that served as their formal models were anonymous.²⁷ Thus allusion to other epigrams by known poets served as a way for Hellenistic epigrammatists to provide their compositions with a specific, identifiable literary pedigree. It is reasonable to speculate, for instance, that one reason the epigrams of Asclepiades (an important figure in the development of amatory epigram if not its inventor) remained an important model for erotic epigram well into late antiquity is that they were (plausibly enough) perceived by later poets as foundational generic archetypes.

In order to illustrate more fully some of the ways in which poets used allusion to other epigrams to construct and locate themselves within a canonical epigrammatic tradition, I turn to Marcus Argentarius 10 GP *Garland* (= *AP* 5.116), in which the speaker asserts the superiority of heterosexual *eros* and instructs his (implicitly male) addressee on how to cure desire for boys:

θῆλυς ἔρως κάλλιστος ἐνὶ θνητοῖσι τέτυκται
 ὅσοις ἐς φιλίην σεμνὸς ἔνεστι νόος.
 εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀρσενικὸν στέργεις πόθον, οἶδα διδάξαι
 φάρμακον, ᾧ παύσεις τὴν δυσέρωτα νόσον.

²⁷ A handful of fourth-century epigrams identify their author; cf. *CEG* 819.5, 13; 888.18–9; 889.7–8; Gutzwiller (1998b: 48); Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 289–91). For Simonides, see above.

στρέψας Μηνοφίλαν εὐίσχιον ἐν φρεσὶν ἔλπου
αὐτὸν ἔχειν κόλποις ἄρσενά Μηνόφιλον.

Love of women is the most beautiful thing among as many mortals
as have a mind serious in regard to loving.
But if you feel desire for males too, I can teach you a
remedy, by which you will stop this amatory disease.
Turn fair-hipped Menophila over and suppose in your mind that
you embrace only a male Menophilus.

This poem belongs to a series of epigrams in which the speaker expresses a preference, one way or another, for women or for boys, and its final couplet, with its recommendation to flip Menophila over and treat her as a male, may be understood as a reworking of a poem by Dioscorides (7 GP = AP 5.54, esp. 5–6; cf. below). In fact, however, the poem's use of other poetry is extremely rich. Its opening words explicitly evoke what may be the earliest extant Hellenistic epigram on the topic, Asclepiades 37 GP (= AP 12.17 = Posidippus 134 AB):²⁸

οὐ μοι θῆλυς ἔρως ἐγκάρδιος, ἀλλὰ με πυρσοὶ
ἄρσενες ἀσβέστω θῆκαν ὑπ' ἀνθρακιῇ.
πλειότερον τόδε θάλπος· ὅσον δυνατώτερος ἄρσην
θηλυτέρης, τόσσον χῶ πόθος ὀξύτερος.

It is not love for women that afflicts my heart, but male
torches have put me under a bed of inextinguishable coals.
This heat is greater. By as much as a man is stronger
than a woman, by so much is the desire sharper.

By alluding to this poem, Argentarius frames his assertion of the primacy of heterosexual desire as a specific rejection of the sentiments expressed by the narrator of Asclepiades' poem—that is, he locates his claim within a literary tradition tracing back to (and in reality beyond) his Hellenistic model.²⁹ As Gow and Page note, however, the larger

²⁸ The authorship of the epigram is uncertain. It is lemmatized as anonymous in P, but in the so-called Appendix Barbarino-Vaticana is ascribed alternatively to Asclepiades or Posidippus, an attribution that must be taken seriously (cf. Cameron (1993: 164–201)). Whoever its author, the poem, which explains homoerotic desire by an appeal to nature, playing on the possibility of understanding θῆλυς to mean both “female and “weak,” and ἄρσην to mean both “male” and “strong,” almost certainly belong to the early third century (*pace* Galli Calderini (1982: 269–70), who dismisses the poem as a banal and pedantic treatment of a rhetorical topos). For the sake of simplicity, I treat the poem as Asclepiades', but without great confidence in the ascription.

²⁹ That the poet has Asclepiades in particular in mind seems guaranteed by use of θῆλυς ἔρως in the nominative in the first line of his epigram. But the allusion to Asclepiades' epigram is mediated by an allusion to Meleager's reworking at 94 GP (= AP 12.41), where the speaker claims to be giving up desire for boys and instead

structure of the opening verse is epic in flavor (*Od.* 1.391 ἢ φῆς τοῦτο κάκιστον ἐν ἀνθρώποισι τετύχθαι, “or do you claim that this [i.e. being king] is the worst thing among mortals?”). This arguably lends to the narrator’s assertion some of the authority and grandeur associated with Homeric poetry, but at the very least the reworking of Telemachus’ comments about kingship represents an assertion of the primacy of the poet’s own epigrammatic amatory concerns over the grander dynastic interests of the Odyssean passage: if being king is not the worst thing for mortals, still it is not, like desire for women, the very best.

The second verse, for its part, engages with another pederastic context, this time archaic rather than Hellenistic. Outside of this poem (and, much later, Cometas *AP* 15.37.4), the phrase ἔνεστι νόος occurs in four passages of elegy, but the model for the verse as a whole seems likely to be a passage of Theognis in which the poet admonishes his addressee Cynos to love him without duplicity (87–90):³⁰

μή μ’ ἔπεσιν μὲν στέργε, νόον δ’ ἔχε καὶ φρένας ἄλλη
εἴ με φιλεῖς καὶ σοι πιστὸς ἔνεστι νόος.
ἢ με φίλει καθαρὸν θέμενος νόον, ἢ μ’ ἀποειπὼν
ἔχθαιρ’ ἀμφοδίην νεῖκος ἀειράμενος.

Don’t love me with words while you have your heart and mind elsewhere,
if you love me and there is a trustworthy mind within you.
Either love me with pure mind or reject me,
hate me and be openly hostile.

Argentarius’ allusion is activated by a combination of language and context: in both passages the phrase ἔνεστι νόος, immediately preceded by an adjective, appears in the context of a discussion of “friendship” (note the conjunction of the phrase with φιλεῖς and ἐς φιλίην, respectively). Indeed, as Gow and Page observe *ad loc.*, Argentarius’ ἐς φιλίην σεμνός seems to refer to those who are “serious in their affections, not mere libertines,” and in that sense the phrase finds a close analogue in Theognis’ πιστός, “trustworthy.” But whereas Theognis instructs his addressee about proper “friendship” between men, Argentarius rejects

turning his attention to women (note the similarity between στέργω θῆλυν ἔρωτα in the third verse of that poem and Argentarius’ ἀρσενικὸν στέργεις πόθον); cf. also Meleager 20 GP (= *AP* 12.87).

³⁰ The lines reappear in minimally varied form at Thgn. 1082c–f. The other passages in which ἔνεστι νόος appears are Thgn. 622 and Solon fr. 11.6.

homoerotic relationships and urges his addressee to turn to “female *eros*.” Argentarius’ allusion to Theognis thus appropriates for his speaker the authority of elegiac paraenesis even while it redefines proper *φιλία* in purely heterosexual terms.

Read against the backdrop of the allusions to Asclepiades and Theognis in the opening lines, the second-person verb of line 3 may be understood to be directed not merely to an unspecified, anonymous internal addressee (as well as to the reader), but to the literary tradition on which the poem is drawing. It serves, in other words, as a marker of the poet’s literary dialogue with a specific model or series of models: in acknowledging that his addressee might feel passion for boys too, the poet tacitly points to his engagement with the (contrary) position adopted by his literary predecessors Asclepiades and Theognis.³¹ Indeed, the poet’s claim that he knows a remedy for the malady of homoerotic desire itself recalls yet another epigram in which the narrator speaks with apparent authority about homoerotic love. In Callimachus 3 GP (= *AP* 12.150), the narrator, adverting to earlier treatments of the Cyclops Polyphemus’ passion for Galatea, asserts that only the Muses—and starvation—can cure love for boys (note 6, *φιλόπαιδα*):

ὥς ἀγαθὴν Πολύφαμος ἀνεύρατο τὰν ἐπαιδὸν
 τῶρα μὲν· ναὶ γὰρ, οὐκ ἀμαθὴς ὁ Κύκλωψ.
 αἱ Μοῖσαι τὸν ἔρωτα κατισχναίνοντι, Φίλιπε·
 ἢ πανακὲς πάντων φάρμακον ἂ σοφία.
 τοῦτο, δοκέω, χά λιμὸς ἔχει μόνον ἐς τὰ πονηρὰ
 τῶγαθόν· ἐκκόπτει τὰν φιλόπαιδα νόσον.
 ἔσθ’ ἅμιν ἥχ’ ἀκαστας† ἀφειδέα ποττὸν Ἑρώτα
 τοῦτ’ εἶπαι· κείρευ τὰ πτερὰ, παιδάριον·
 οὐδ’ ὅσον ἀττάραγόν τυ δεδοίκαμες· αἱ γὰρ ἐπῳδαὶ
 οἴκοι τῷ χαλεπῷ τραύματος ἀμφοτέραι.

What a lover’s charm Polyphemus discovered.

By Earth, the Cyclops was no ignoramus!

The Muses dry up love, Philip;

poetry is indeed a cure for every illness.

Only it, I think, and hunger do against difficult circumstances

any good: it eradicates the sickness of love for boys

³¹ Cf. also Thgn. 1367–8 “a boy shows gratitude, but no companion can trust a woman: she loves whoever is on hand” (*παιδὸς τοι χάρις ἐστί· γυναικὶ δὲ πιστὸς ἐταῖρος / οὐδεὶς, ἀλλ’ αἰεὶ τὸν παρεόντα φιλεῖ*).

We can say... to Eros when he is implacable:
 “Clip your wings, boy. We don’t fear you
 in the least. For we have a store
 of both charms against your harsh wounds.”

Argentarius’ allusion to Callimachus’ poem is triggered by the collocation within a single line of φάρμακον (“remedy”) and the phrase παύσεις τὴν δυσέρωτα νόσον (“you will stop this amatory malady”), which taken together recall the Callimachean narrator’s claim that wisdom—which is to say, poetry—is a remedy (φάρμακον) that “eradicates the sickness of love for boys” (ἐκκόπτει τὰν φιλόπαιδα νόσον). For its part, Callimachus’ poem seems to allude to Theocritus’ treatment—itsself indebted to a dithyramb by Philoxenus—of Polyphemus’ love for Galatea in *Idyll* 11, where the narrator claims to have discovered song to be a cure for love.

Read against that background, Argentarius’ use of the adjective δύσερως (“unfortunate in love” or the like)³² warrants brief comment. As Gow and Page note, the adjective δύσερως is sometimes used in homoerotic contexts in epigram (e.g., Leonidas 31.8 GP = *AP* 306.8)—though it is not restricted to them—and in this connection it appears within close compass of φιλόπαις, “boy-loving,” the adjective used in Argentarius’ Callimachean model, in several poems (e.g., Meleager 86.1 GP = *AP* 12.81.1; and 113.1 GP = *AP* 12.49.1). Argentarius’ use of the word as a variation of Callimachus’ φιλόπαιδα is thus not unusual.³³ Given the highly allusive character of the epigram, however, it is not beyond the realm of plausibility that the adjective evokes the description of Polyphemus at Theocritus *Idyll* 6.7 as “a man unfortunate in love and a goatherd” (δυσέρωτα καὶ αἰπόλον ἄνδρα; cf. *Id.* 1.85, of Daphnis), in the context of a poem clearly designed to be read as a pair with *Idyll* 11.³⁴ If so, Argentarius’ use of the adjective may be a case of “window” allusion,³⁵ in which the evocation of one model (in this case, Callimachus’ epigram) is mediated by the evocation of that model’s source (here Theocritus’ Cyclops poems).

³² The earliest attestations of the word seem to mean, “loving that which one ought not to love,” a sense appropriate to the context of Argentarius’ epigram; see Ogilvie (1962: 107–8).

³³ There is a parallel variation between the adjectives in “Simonides” 3.6 GP (= *AP* 7.24.6) τὴν φιλόπαιδα χέλυν and Leonidas 31.8 GP (= *AP* 306.8) τὸν δυσέρωτα χέλυν, both of Anacreon.

³⁴ Cf. also Posidippus 19.7–8 AB, with Hunter (2004b) and Raimondi (2005).

³⁵ On this phenomenon, see Thomas (1999: 130), who uses the term “reference” rather than “allusion.”

Argentarius' allusion to Callimachus thus sets his own epigram in a tradition of Hellenistic poems on the question of how to cure love-sickness in general,³⁶ and (as in Callimachus' epigram) homoerotic love-sickness in particular. As in the first couplet, allusion to earlier poetry serves as a foil. Whereas Theocritus and Callimachus suggested (with great ambiguity of tone) song as means of eliminating altogether the pain of unrequited love, Argentarius turns the theme in a different direction and proposes a sexual solution for (at least temporarily) hindering his addressee's longing for boys. The allusion to Callimachus in the fourth verse prepares readers for a recommendation for eliminating desire, and the actual suggestion, adapted from a poem by Dioscorides in which the speaker offers advice on how to have sex with a pregnant woman,³⁷ comes as a humorous surprise—all the more so in that Argentarius has pointedly replaced the Muses of Callimachus' epigram with intercourse *a tergo*. All of this is crucial for evaluating the poem's tone: it has seemed "declamatory and pretentious" to at least one reader (Del Re (1955: 199)), but that effect is surely complicated by the subtle and amusing way in which the poet draws on a long literary tradition to establish a claim to expertise and authority on matters of sex and love.

In its intensive engagement with the epigrammatic past, Argentarius' epigram, obscene in content and highly refined in its approach, is hardly unusual. Such engagement of one poet with another's work (or with other poems of his own)—whether it began life only in written form or in the context of the symposium³⁸—is a natural outgrowth of the agonistic literary culture of the Hellenistic period and may be productively treated as a matter of emulation—that is, as a form of literary competition in which a poet both signals his familiarity with a model and improves upon it. Occasionally, we may even catch a glimpse of a poet calling attention to his emulative stance towards a model: in an epigram by Callimachus (26 GP = 48 Pf. = AP 6.310), for instance, the claim of the speaker, a tragic mask of Dionysus, that

³⁶ On claims about love-sickness in Hellenistic epigram, see Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 338–49).

³⁷ 7 GP (= AP 5.54): "Never, enjoying sex with her when she is heavy with child, bed a pregnant woman face to face. For there is a huge wave in between, and the labor will be great for her as she is rowed and for you as you toss in the swell. Instead, turning her round, delight in her rosy ass, considering sex with your wife to be sex with a boy." Both Dioscorides' and Argentarius' epigrams consist of six verses, with the affirmative recommendation offered in the final couplet (note στρέψας in v. 5 of each epigram; Argentarius' ἔλπου corresponds to Dioscorides' νομίσας).

³⁸ Cf. Cameron (1995: 71–103).

he gapes “twice as wide as the Samian” is clearly a reference to the temple of “gaping Dionysus” at Samos, but may also serve as a subtle marker of the poem’s rivalry with an epigram by the Samian poet Asclepiades (27 *GP* = *AP* 6.308).³⁹ But it is important to recognize that the “art of variation”⁴⁰ is not exclusively a vehicle for epigrammatists to display their enormous creativity. As *Argentarius*’ poem shows, by incorporating into their compositions the themes and language of the epigrammatic genre, individual poets generated meaning and significance for their own work.

³⁹ On these poems, see Fantuzzi in this volume.

⁴⁰ See, e.g., the foundational studies of Ludwig (1968) and Tarán (1979) and (1985).

GLOSSING HOMER: HOMERIC EXEGESIS IN EARLY THIRD CENTURY EPIGRAM

Evina Sistakou

The key to understanding what differentiates poetic practice in Ptolemaic Alexandria from earlier phases of Greek literature lies in the prominence of writing and reading.¹ Archaic poetry, an oral art, depended on performance; classical poetry was defined by the social and political context of the Greek city-state. In the post-classical world these preconditions changed radically; as individuality prevailed over social identity, the poet did not present himself as the public *sophos* but rather as a denizen of the library. The library *par excellence* was undoubtedly the Mouseion of Alexandria, an archive of texts from the past, where both literary and scientific knowledge were institutionalized. As Simon Goldhill aptly remarks, “the archive as context for poetic production is seen in the constant, even obsessional, awareness of past texts. The poet, as Posidippus puts it, has a soul ἐν βύβλοις πεπονημένη, ‘worked out in books.’”²

As a result of this “bookish” culture, Hellenistic poets were deeply and intensely engaged with scholarship. Text editing, classification of genres, lexicographical research, and critical annotation of the great works of the past—such kinds of philological interpretation led inevitably to a new kind of poetry: learned, intellectual, élitist. Homeric scholarship in particular formed a separate field of philological knowledge, a distinctive discipline, dealing with problems of text editing, language and style.

This essentially linguistic analysis of the Homeric epics is reflected in the use of Homeric words of special lexicographical interest by Hellenistic poets: *hapax* and *dis legomena*, toponyms, variants of the Homeric text. Our interest in finding Homeric lexical rarities in Hellenistic poetry has many aspects. From a philological point of view, we may trace back to the first generation of Alexandrian poets explanations of Homeric vocabulary, syntax or lexical usage either derived from

¹ Brilliantly outlined by Bing (1988b: *passim*).

² Goldhill (1991: 224).

older collections of scholia or only recorded in later scholiastic tradition. In the first case we may assume lack of originality, in the second pioneering lexicographical analysis. The incorporation of controversial Homeric vocabulary into Alexandrian poetry is of crucial importance to the history of scholarship in general, and to that of Homeric textual criticism in particular, since we lack evidence for the editing work of influential scholars of the early third century, such as Zenodotus of Ephesus or even Callimachus and Apollonius of Rhodes.

Yet, with the exception of a few innovative studies in the nineteenth century, it is only in recent decades that there has been any documentation of the essential relationship between poetry and scholarship in Hellenistic Alexandria. Nevertheless, a “philological” reading of Apollonius’ *Argonautica* and the poetry of Callimachus has gone a long way toward solving the fundamental problem of *interpretatio homerica*.³ This approach has also shed light on the influence which the pre-Hellenistic scholiastic tradition (chiefly the D *scholia* dating back to the fifth century), glossography and the editing work of Zenodotus had upon the *poetae docti* of the period. The more learned among these even seem to anticipate Aristarchus of Samothrace (second century B.C.), the most distinguished Homeric scholar of all.⁴ Since it is in the early period, around the time that Zenodotus was active, and particularly the pre-Aristarchan period, for which Homeric scholarship is the least documented, I have chosen to present as case studies for the exegesis of Homerisms through poetry four epigrammatists from the third century B.C., namely Simias of Rhodes, Asclepiades of Samos, Posidippus of Pella and Callimachus of Cyrene.⁵

The use of abstruse poetic words, better known as *glossai* (γλῶσσαι),⁶ by these epigrammatists has both philological and poetic implications. Obviously the glossographical tradition influenced these poets. Simias himself had three books of Γλῶσσαι to his name; Asclepiades and

³ From de Jan’s 1893 thesis on Homeric interpretation in Callimachus to the work of Erbse (1953) and the meticulous investigations of Rengakos (1993) and (1994) and Montanari (2002); see the critical survey in Rengakos (1994: 12–20). For a modern theoretical approach to the *poeta doctus*, see *Aevum Antiquum* (1995), a special volume dedicated to this topic.

⁴ Apollonius does not simply follow the older D *scholia*—as Erbse (1953) assumed—but anticipates interpretations which are subsequently attributed to Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchus; see Rengakos (1994: 151–78) and (2001).

⁵ In epigrams cited I follow Gow-Page’s edition (1965); for the “New Posidippus,” Bastianini and Galazzi (2001).

⁶ For the use of *glossai* in poetry see Hunter (2005).

Posidippus, although not active scholars, shared a common admiration for Antimachus of Colophon's *Lyde*, thus showing the significance they attached to how glossography and poetry could be fused creatively; finally, Callimachus was influenced by the glossographer and poet Philitas of Cos, and his philological work, like that of the glossographers,⁷ is characterized by a Peripatetic enthusiasm for collecting lexical rarities.⁸

The idea that interpretations of ambiguous words are deliberately embedded in the poetic context, intended only for the intellectual to detect them, is pivotal for my discussion. Indeed, one of the prominent characteristics of the literary, as opposed to the inscribed, epigram consists in the activation of the reader's imagination to fill in missing information.⁹ Some other generic features of literary epigram, its brevity and conciseness combined with an extreme care for form, elaborate diction and word order, conform perfectly to such poetic devices. A riddling word, referring to an academic controversy on its proper meaning in the Homeric epics, can make up the core of an epigram; its placement at the beginning or towards the end may also constitute the poem's *pointe*. I shall therefore attempt to demonstrate if and to what extent the poetics of exegesis play a significant role in the overall interpretation of certain literary epigrams.¹⁰

Along with Philitas of Cos,¹¹ the enigmatic poet and grammarian Simias of Rhodes (ca. 300 B.C.) was a forerunner of the Alexandrian scholar-poets. Epigram 1 GP (= AP 7.203) is an epitaph for a partridge, 2 GP (= AP 7.193) refers to a cicada captured and kept in a cage, and 3 GP (= AP 6.113) describes a bow made from the horns of a goat. Their

⁷ Few of Callimachus' interpretations have their origins in the glossographers, however; see Rengakos (1992: 28–31). Callimachus directly echoes the glossographers in τοῖος=ἄγαθός in fr. 627 Pf. (= fr. 31a Dyck); Tosi (1997), however, places more emphasis on Callimachus' divergence from them.

⁸ Pfeiffer (1968: 134–40); elsewhere Pfeiffer traces the beginnings of the glossographical method back to Aristotle (1968: 78–9). On Philitas as a glossographer we have now the annotated edition of Dettori (2000: 19–49). On the influence of Philitas on the poetic vocabulary of Callimachus, see Spanoudakis (2002: 384–400).

⁹ The act of reading epigrams included in books is analyzed by Gutzwiller (1998b: 1–14). Cf. also the term *Ergänzungsspiel* for the process of supplementation of information in literary epigrams which are removed from their original context in Bing (1995b).

¹⁰ It is not irrelevant that epigrams on poets formed a distinct thematic category within the anthologies. On Homer in particular, recognized as a literary predecessor of Hellenistic epigram, see Bolmarcich (2002), and of course the thorough analysis by Skiadas (1965).

¹¹ Bing (2003).

elaborate vocabulary, consisting of Homeric *hapax* and similar lexical rarities, is typical of Simias' "philological" style, most prominently displayed in his *technopaegnia*.¹² Simias' use of controversial Homeric words in these intertextually connected epigrams illustrates to what degree they reflect scholarly exegesis.

The subject matter of the epideictic epigram 3 GP (= AP 6.113) is, as noted above, a bow made from the horns of a goat:

Πρόσθε μὲν ἀγραύλοιο δασύτριχος ἰξάλου αἰγὸς
 †δοῖον ἐπὶ χλωροῖς ἐστεφόμεν πετάλοις†
 νῦν δέ με Νικομάχῳ κεραοξὸς ἤρμοσε τέκτων
 ἐντανύσας ἔλικος καρτερὰ νεῦρα βοός.

Formerly I was one of the two horns of a hairy
 wild ibex, garlanded with green leaves;
 but now a worker of horn has prepared me for Nicomachus,
 stretching on me the strong sinew of a twisted-horned ox.

Simias' model here is the description of Pandarus' bow in *Il.* 4.105–13; the imitation of the Iliadic passage is so close that the epigram is a pastiche of its vocabulary. The first line paraphrases 105–6, ἀντίκ' ἐσύλα τόξον ἐύξοον ἰξάλου αἰγὸς/ ἀγρίου ("straightway he uncovered his polished bow made from the horn of a wild ibex"). Simias uses the adjective ἰξαλος, a *hapax*, without taking a clear stand on its meaning;¹³ the adjective ἀγραυλος, however, is almost certainly a substitute for the Homeric ἄγριος ("wild"). Simias avoids the predominant meaning in the *scholia*, i.e., that ἀγραυλος refers to someone who lives in the fields, thus favoring the marginal meaning "wild" recorded only in D *scholia* (*ad Il.* 17.521).¹⁴ And in the final line about the construction of the bow, he fuses νεῦρα βόεια ("ox's sinew," 4.122) and the noun νευρή ("bowstring," from the same Iliadic passage, 4.118, 123, 125);¹⁵ even the opaque formulaic adjective ἔλιξ for oxen is reproduced—without any indication as to its meaning.¹⁶

¹² Fränkel (1915: index verborum) traces more than 70 *glossai*, *hapax* and exceptional uses in Simias' fragments.

¹³ There is a similar problem with ἰξαλος in Leonidas of Tarentum 32.1 GP (= AP 9.99.1). From the various meanings in the *scholia*, Gow-Page (1965: 2.342) favor—somewhat arbitrarily—the explanation τέλειος ("full grown").

¹⁴ It obviously has the same meaning in Lycophron 990, λεῦσσον φόνον τ' ἔμφυλον ἀγραύλων λύκων ("beholding the kindred slaughter of the wild wolves").

¹⁵ Aristarchus sees a semantic difference between the nouns νευραῖ and νεῦρα (Σ *Did/Hrd ad Il.* 3.35c).

¹⁶ Simias bypasses the thorny problem of its derivation from either ἐλίσσω, "to

Simias' technique in dealing with Homeric *glossai* seems to be two-fold. On the one hand, he reproduces problematic Homeric words with no sign of interpretation; on the other hand, he illuminates his understanding of ἄγραυλος by reference to the clear-cut meaning of ἄγριος in his model passage, thus taking his first steps in the direction of fusing poetic and philological discourse in the narrow confines of an epigram.

Two further examples may deepen our understanding of this peculiarly Hellenistic device. Simias twice varies the Homeric δρίος πολυανθέος ὕλης, "a thicket of leafy wood" (*Od.* 14.353), as ὕλην δρίος εὖσκιον (1.1 GP) and εὐδενδρον δρίος (2.1 GP). By ὕληεις ("wooded"), εὖσκιον ("shadowy"), and εὐδενδρος ("abounding in trees"), respectively, Simias not only varies the Homeric passage; he also points to the semantic obscurity of δρίος; but this enigmatic *glossa* needs to be further modified by additional adjectives.¹⁷ That same need for adjectival elucidation is also presupposed in the Odyssean passage and in the Hesiodic formula δρία βησσήεντα (*Op.* 530), and Simias is the only later poet to maintain it.¹⁸

In the last example the juxtaposition of a *glossa* and a near-synonym used as its lexicographical explanation define the overall interpretation of the epigram. In the epitaph for a partridge, the bird's species is described with the ambivalent Homeric *hapax* ἀγρότα (1.1 GP, ἀγρότα πέρδιξ). It was a matter of scholarly debate whether the word in *Od.* 16.218 derived from ἀγρός ("country") or ἄγρα ("hunting," e.g., in Hsch. *s.v.* ἀγρόται. ἢ θηρευταί). With θηρεύων βαλιούς συνομήλικας ἐν νομῷ ὕλης ("hunting your spotted fellow-birds in the wood-land," 3) Simias stresses his own interpretation, using the participle θηρεύων ("hunt") as an equivalent to ἀγρότα, thus accurately describing the deceased partridge's former activity.¹⁹

turn or wind round," or the dialectal ἔλι=μέλαν, "black, dark" (*Σ D ad Il.* 1.98); cf. Gow-Page (1965: 2.513).

¹⁷ The explanation in *Σ Q ad Od.* 14.353, δρίος] σύνδενδρον χωρίον, δρυόδης καὶ σύσκιος τόπος ("a place full of trees, woody and thickly shaded"), is misleading, because the scholiast glosses the *hapax* noun δρίος along with its context. For this glossographic method of individuated interpretation see Dyck (1987: 122–4).

¹⁸ See Heubeck and Hoekstra (1989: *ad Od.* 14.353) commenting on Hesiod's collocation δρία βησσήεντα (*Op.* 530).

¹⁹ The erroneous interpretation ἀγρότης=*venator* (Ebeling, *s.v.*) is Hellenistic in origin according to Fränkel (1915: 101); for a detailed commentary on the relevant passages in Apollonius of Rhodes, Leonidas of Tarentum and perhaps Anyte of Tegea, see Rengakos (1994: 32–3).

Unlike Simias, Asclepiades of Samos generally makes use of a simple, comprehensible language in his epigrams, avoiding sophisticated vocabulary; however, a recent study has identified close links between the epic idiolect and at least some of Asclepiades' epigrams.²⁰ Asclepiades' deployment of Homerisms does not, however, attempt to elucidate controversial words. We see this in his use of the term *χαροπός*, through which he likens the lover's gaze to the gleam of a flash of lightning (3.3–4 GP = AP 5.153.3–4): αἱ χαροπαὶ Κλεοφώντος... γλυκεροῦ βλέμματος ἄστεροπαί ("the bright lightning of Cleophon's sweet gaze"). This Homeric *hapax*, found as an adjective used to describe lions in *χαροποί τε λέοντες* (*Od.* 11.611), probably implies something about the ferocity of the animal. Obviously Asclepiades adopts its generalized post-Homeric use which connotes a "brilliant, lively gaze"; in other words, he is either ignorant of or unconcerned with the underlying philological problem.²¹

Even when Asclepiades seems to be aware of a scholiastic disagreement on an ambiguous Homeric word, he uses it without attempting new approaches regarding its meaning. The Homeric *hapax* κρήγυνον in *Il.* 1.106, μάντι κακῶν, οὐ πώ ποτέ μοι τὸ κρήγυνον εἶπας ("seer of evil, never yet have you spoken to me a pleasant thing") has either the meaning "true" or "virtuous, good". The extant *scholia* accept this double meaning but tend to attribute only the second to the Homeric passage (from Σ D *ad Il.* 1.106: τὸ κρήγυνον· τὸ ἀληθές· νῦν δὲ τὸ ἀγαθόν ("τὸ κρήγυνον here not in the sense of 'true' but of 'good'") up to Aristarchus Σ Ariston *ad Il.* 1.106c καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθές, ἀλλ' ἀγαθόν ("not in the sense of 'true' but of 'good'")). Asclepiades adopts the meaning "good" in 30.3–4 GP (= AP 7.284.3–4) as the context makes clear: ἦν δὲ τὸν Εὐμάρεω καθέλης τάφον, ἄλλο μὲν οὐδὲν/ κρήγυνον, εὐρήσεις δ' ὅστέα καὶ σποδιήν ("if you destroy the tomb of Eumares, it shall not be of profit to you, for you shall find nothing more but bones and ashes").²²

²⁰ Sens (2002a) successfully locates many of Asclepiades' Homerisms (*hapax legomena*, analogical formations, and the use of formulaic language).

²¹ Ebeling renders it as "fulgidus, rarus" (although Düntzer has "ferus"), whereas LSJ and Montanari (2004) explain it as "fierce." Eustathius attempts to reconcile the two conflicting meanings, talking about a kind of euphemism (*ad Od.* 11.611 μᾶλλον γὰρ φοβερὸς ὁ λέων καὶ οὐ χαρὰν ποιῶν, ἥδη δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὸ θανατοποιόν, "the lion is rather terrible and doesn't bring joy, for it causes death"). See Sens in this volume.

²² Theocritus understands the adjective in the same way in 13.3 GP (= AP 13.3.3) εἰ δ' ἔσσι κρήγυός τε καὶ παρὰ χρηστῶν, as does Damagetus in 8.4 GP (= AP 7.355.4).

Another example is found in the epitaph for Ajax (29 GP = *AP* 7.145). The personification of Arete, sitting on Ajax' tomb, describes her anguish with the phrase *θυμὸν ἄχει μεγάλῳ βεβολημένῳ* ("stricken with sore grief to my heart," 3). Asclepiades clearly here uses the Homeric formula *ἄχει μεγάλῳ βεβολημένος* ("stricken with sore grief," *Il.* 9.9, *Od.* 10.247), but replaces *κῆρ* and *ἦτορ* of the Homeric text with the semantic equivalent, *θυμός*. He thus remains faithful to the Homeric text's distinction between *βεβλημένος* (having to do with a physical wound) and *βεβολημένος* (describing metaphorically a psychological "blow"), a distinction which is crystallized later in Aristarchus (*Σ* Ariston. *ad Il.* 9.9b: *πάλιν τὸ βεβολημένος τὸ διὰ τοῦ ο ἐπὶ ψυχῆς λέγει* ("βεβολημένος with ο again refers to the soul")).

Above, Asclepiades displays both his acquaintance with Homeric exegesis and his un-philological attitude when it comes to its poetic utilization. Asclepiades' "Homerizing style," whereby he reproduces "orthodox" uses of much-discussed or ambiguous words, is to be differentiated from the more meticulously philological readings of Posidippus and, to a higher degree, those of Callimachus.

Although we have no evidence of any scholarly activity undertaken by Posidippus of Pella in the Ptolemaic Museion, his penchant for the use of abstruse Homeric words has long been noted. Posidippus shares with his older contemporary Asclepiades the same admiration for Antimachus' *Lyde*, a learned narrative elegy, very popular in early third century Alexandria.²³ Antimachus' poem, excessively dependent on obscure epic language,²⁴ presumably influenced Posidippus' style. Strong evidence of this influence can be found in his epigrams, especially those in the "New Posidippus," which reveal a veritable zeal for questions of Homeric exegesis.²⁵ According to the Homeric scholia (*Σ* Did *ad Il.* 11.101a = Posidippus fr. 701 *SH* = 144 AB), Aristarchus had two

On the meaning "true" in the pseudo-Theocritean Idyll 20.19, in Leonidas 10 GP (= *AP* 7.648) and in Archias *AP* 5.58, see Gow-Page (1965: 2.321).

²³ In *AP* 12.168 (= 9 GP = 140 AB) and 9.63 (= Asclepiades 32 GP) respectively. The *Lyde* was severely criticized by Callimachus for its epicizing style (fr. 398 Pf.). On the *Lyde*'s main stylistic and thematic features, and the controversial opinions of Alexandrian scholar-poets regarding its aesthetic evaluation, see Matthews (1996: 26–3).

²⁴ For Antimachus' *recherché* vocabulary, and his influence on the epic language of Apollonius, see Matthews (1996: 51–7).

²⁵ Rampichini (2004) traces the relevant linguistic explanations in the Homeric citations of Posidippus 21–4 AB. Linguistic parallels between Posidippus and Homer are cited by Livrea (2002) and di Benedetto (2003).

editions of Posidippus' epigrams at his disposal, a first, entitled Σωρός, and a second or final edition (νῦν ἐν τοῖς Ποσειδίππου ἐπιγράμμασι). In the first, Posidippus included the name Βήρισος, a (playful?) misreading of the Homeric phrase βῆ ῥ' Ἴσον, which he however removed from the following edition, thereby acknowledging an emendation by Zenodotus.²⁶ Elsewhere, in his choice of the variant καταμήσεις (19.14 AB) as opposed to Zenodotus' variant in *Il.* 18.34, ἀποτμήξειε, he anticipates Aristarchus, who opts for ἀπαμήσειε.²⁷ Aristarchus is also indirectly supported by the conjecture Ἀράβω[ν ἵππο]μάχων in 10.10 AB: Aristarchus is considered to have corrected the *vulgata* variant from ἱππόδαμοι to ἱππόμαχοι at *Il.* 10.431 (Σ *Did ad Il.* 10.431cl). If the conjecture in Posidippus' text is correct, then the Hellenistic poet would have recognized the Homeric *hapax* ἱππόμαχος as an adjective, in all probability also echoing the tradition of the lyric poets (only two examples are attested, Mimnermus 14.3 W and Simonides *AP* 6.2.4).

Homeric toponyms were also subject to debate by the Alexandrians.²⁸ With the periphrastic toponym Ἀλήϊον γῆν (14.3 AB) in the context of the myth of Bellerophon, Posidippus refers to the false etymology in *Il.* 6.201 ὁ [*sc.* Βελλεροφόντης] κέπ πεδίον τὸ Ἀλήϊον οἶος ἀλάτο ("Bellerophon...wandered alone over the Aleian plain"). His use of the form Ἀλήϊος for the feminine shows that it must be classed as a two-termination adjective in -ος, -ον, and thus that its first element should be construed as the privative ἄ-.²⁹ If Posidippus indeed wanted to draw attention to the fact that the name derived from λήϊον-ληίς ("field or crop") by means of this grammatical artifice, then he was alluding to the etymology of the adjective ἀλήϊος ("poor in lands") given by the exegetical *scholia* (Σ *ex. ad Il.* 9.125a).³⁰ In this way he was probably also

²⁶ The compliance with Zenodotus' text is proposed by Gow-Page (1965: 2.483–4), and also by Nagy (2004: 61–4), who believes that Βήρισος belongs to the "exotic" variants condemned as neoteric by Aristarchus. Cameron (1993: 375–6) argues that Posidippus invented the name Βήρισος in order to provoke Zenodotus; cf. also Reitzenstein and Merkelbach's explanation (cited by Cameron) that he coined it for a sympotic game, and Rampichini (2004: 283).

²⁷ Rampichini (2004: 283) mentions the conflict between Posidippus and Zenodotus. On the variation ἀπαμάω-ἀμάομαι, see Rengakos (1993: 99). Di Benedetto (2003: 5) maintains that Posidippus derives ἀμάω from ἄμα, and therefore he understood it as "collect, gather." On the contrary, Petrain (2003: 385–7) suggests the meaning "cut down."

²⁸ On Callimachus' exegesis of Homeric geography, see Sistakou (2002).

²⁹ This sharp observation is made by Bastianini and Galazzi (2001: 124 *ad loc.*), where the alternative etymologies of the toponym are listed.

³⁰ There is a third possible etymology, from ἄλς, on which the grammarians were also divided (Σ *Ariston. ad Il.* 6.201a).

providing an answer to a latent issue concerning the “double” etymology of the same Homeric word depending on whether it occurs as a proper noun (in which case false etymology serves a poetic purpose) or as an adjective; in any case, it seems that this inconsistency is resolved in Posidippus’ epigram.

With Posidippus the practice of putting a *glossa* and its near-synonym side by side develops into a poetic strategy; using examples from the New Posidippus’ *Lithika*, a collection of epigrams on stones and gems, I shall attempt to illustrate this poetic strategy and its variations.³¹ The finest characteristics of the stones come into view only after the reader has successfully decoded certain enigmatic key words, mostly Homeric *glossai*.³² For example, it is not easy to tell exactly how Posidippus understood the adjective ἄστεροεις as a metaphor for lapis lazuli in 5.1 AB, ἄστερόεντα σάπειρον. The adjective ἄστεροεις (“starred, starry”) refers to the sky or specifically to constellations³³—with the exception of two passages from the *Iliad*, where the adjective takes on a metaphorical hue: at 16.134 it is used to describe Achilles’ cuirass and at 18.370 the dwelling of Hephaestus. The cases are not identical; if in the second instance we can justify transferring the quality of the sky to the dwelling of the fire god, in the first its connotation is more precise. While ancient scholiasts are uncertain as to whether the term should be rendered as “decorated with stars,” “brilliant like a star,” or even “in the shape of a star,”³⁴ to judge from the use of descriptive adjectives in the rest of the *Lithika*, it is unlikely that Posidippus refers to the stone’s shape here. Hence he must be referring either to its golden color—as one may furthermore gather from the phrase χρυσίτην... ἡμίλιθον in the following line—or in particular to the yellowish specks of lapis lazuli which the ancients believed were due to the presence of gold within the stone.³⁵ In both cases, Posidippus makes sure that he provides his

³¹ Translations of the New Posidippus by Acosta-Hughes, Kosmetatou and Smith are available at the online journal *Classics@ 1* (http://www.chs.harvard.edu/publications.sec/classics.ssp/trans_en_lithika.pg), in Austin and Bastianini (2002), and by Nisetich in Gutzwiller (2005c: 17–41).

³² Though not drawing attention to the use of Homerisms but to technical writing underlying the *Lithika*, Smith (2003: 105) acutely remarks: “The names for these stones are not used ornamentally by Posidippus; rather it is often the case that the nature of the stone, some exceptional quality, is tied directly to the meaning of the epigram.”

³³ E.g., Hes. *Th.* 106, *h.Hom.* 30.17, A.R. 3.1003, Arat. 548, *AP* 7.62.2; 9.18.4.

³⁴ Σ ex. *ad Il.* 16.134a1 ἄστρων μορφαῖς πεποικιλμένον (“wrought with stars”), Σ *ad Il.* 18.370a2 ἄστερόεντα δὲ τὸν λαμπρόν, οὐ τὸν ἄστερόδη (“ἄστερόεντα meaning radiant, not star-like”). On the cosmological dimension of ἄστεροεις, see Hardie (1985: 12–4).

³⁵ Bastianini and Galazzi (2001: 113 *ad loc.*) favor the second option, based on

reader with a solution to this lexical riddle, in glossing ἀστερόεις with χρυσίτης.

Another example of this technique can be found in epigram 11 AB on an engraved pearl. The phrase ἐ<ν> γλύμματι κοίλῳ (“in hollow incision,” 3) corresponds to the γλαφυρὸν γλύμμα (“hollow engraving,” 6) at the end of the epigram; their symmetrical arrangement, almost in a scheme of *Ringkomposition*, emphasizes their philological interrelation. Replacing the adjective κοῖλος with γλαφυρός, Posidippus echoes Σ H *ad Od.* 5.194 γλαφυρὸν] κοῖλον διὰ τὸ γλύφεσθαι (“γλαφυρὸν: hollow because of being carved;” cf. also Σ V *ad Od.* 8.257). Moreover, Posidippus does not simply put two synonymous adjectives side by side, but, by using them to modify γλύμμα, he shows that he shares the scholiast’s etymology διὰ τὸ γλύφεσθαι.

The use of Homeric *glossai* in 13 AB is more sophisticated:

κ[ερδα]λέη λίθος ἦδε· λιπα[ινομένη]ς γε μὲν ἀντήης,
[φέγγο]ς ὅλους ὄγκους θαυ[μ’ἀπάτη]ς περιθειῖ·
ὄ[γκων] δ’ ἀσκελέων, ὠκὺ γ[λυπτὸς λ]ίς ὁ Πέρσης
[τε]ίνων ἀστράπτει πρὸς καλὸν ἥελιον.

This is a cunning stone. When oiled,
a lustre, a miracle of mirage, follows its entire mass.
Yet when it is drying, presently a Persian engraved [lion]
shows brilliant stretching against the lovely sun.

(trans. Kosmetatou and Acosta-Hughes)

The epigram’s overall structure resembles that of a riddle: “there is a cunning stone; when oiled it shines, when dry its carving becomes visible; what is it?”³⁶ Homerisms are built in, making it all the more enigmatic for the reader. κ[ερδα]λέη λίθος (“cunning stone”) functions as a cue to the reader for the epigram’s riddling nature. The use of the adjective also points to a specific meaning discussed in the Homeric scholia, i.e., the last of the extant meanings in D *scholia* in *Il.* 10.44: κερδαλέης: συνετής, ὠφελίμου, ἢ πανούργου (“intelligent, profitable or cunning”).³⁷ A key to understanding the second half of the riddle lies in

Philostratus (*VA* 1.25). Smith (2003: 108) notes that with the addition of χρυσίτην the reader understands that the stone “is not simply starred, perhaps with white stars like the nighttime sky, but is golden-speckled.”

³⁶ Smith (2003: 110–2) describes it as a riddle epigram, recalling at the same time Bing’s analysis of the process of *Ergänzungsspiel* as a means of understanding Hellenistic epigrams (1995b).

³⁷ Apparently also adopting its derivation from the word κερδῶ = “fox,” and not from κέρδος (see Σ D *ad Il.* 1.149).

the interpretation of ἄσκελέων. In post-Homeric literature, the adjective ἄσκελής is usually etymologized from privative ἀ- and σκέλος (“leg”).³⁸ However, the Homeric ἄσκελής, more frequently in the adverbial form ἄσκελές-ἄσκελῶς, derives from the verb σκέλλω “to make dry.” In its adjectival form it constitutes a Homeric *hapax* in *Od.* 10.463, where Σ BQ note ἄσκελέες καὶ ἄθυμοι] ἄγαν κατεσκληκότες καὶ κεκηκότες, σκληροὶ, ἐσκελετευμένοι καὶ νενεκρωμένοι καὶ ψυχικῆς ἰσχύος ἐστερημένοι (“so withered and weary, reduced to skeletons, lifeless, without any mental strength”). Posidippus draws attention to the fact that he uses ἄσκελής (3) with its specific Homeric meaning—and not with the contemporaneous Hellenistic sense³⁹—by juxtaposing it with the participle λιπα[ινομένη]ς (1) in the same epigram.

The riddling quality of another epigram, 15 AB, has been recognized by scholars.⁴⁰ It concerns the so-called snakestone (*draconitis* in Pliny 37.158), a stone that may not have existed at all except in the imagination.⁴¹ The first three verses of the epigram describe the stone’s miraculous origin from the brain of a dying snake (15.1–3 AB):

οὐ ποταμὸς κελάδων ἐπὶ χεῖλεσιν, ἀλλὰ δράκοντος
εἶχε ποτ’ εὐπύγων τόνδε λίθον κεφαλῇ
πυκνὰ φαληριόωντα

No river rolled this stone onto its banks, but at one time
the well-bearded head of a snake held it,
streaked with white.

(trans. Smith)

Posidippus is alluding to an image recurrent in the *Lithika*, the river or sea-wave bearing within it precious stones and gems. Water imagery is here supported by enigmatic Homerisms which lend to the passage its peculiar, almost grotesque atmosphere. The gem is not, as usually, washed up to the banks of a “sounding, roaring” river, κελάδων. With this adjective Posidippus alludes to a typical Homeric river (*Il.* 18.576 πὰρ ποταμὸν κελάδοντα; cf. 21.16 ῥόος κελάδων of the river

³⁸ Pl. *Ti.* 34a5 ἄσκελές καὶ ἄπου, Arist. *GA* 717b17.

³⁹ Theocritus 20.2–3 GP (= *AP* 9.437.2–3 = 4.2–3 Gow), ξόανον/ ἄσκελές (“wooden image without legs”), is a well known example.

⁴⁰ See the excellent analysis by Smith (2003: 112–7).

⁴¹ Smith (2003: 113) wonders: “Is this an actual class of stones recognized at the time but to which a false origin had been ascribed, or did the snakestone never exist except in the world of technical writing on stones?”

Xanthus).⁴² Gradually Posidippus moves from the actual image of the (Homeric) river to the description of the gem's color, which is white like the foam of (Homeric) waves on the sea.⁴³ The second Homerism of the passage, πυκνὰ φαληριόωντα ("streaked with white," 3), placed at the beginning of the hexameter, undoubtedly echoes the description of the waves in *Il.* 13.799, κυρτὰ φαληριόωντα, πρὸ μὲν τ' ἄλλ', αὐτὰρ ἐπ' ἄλλα ("high-arched and white with foam, some first and after them others"). The acoustic analogy between the words πυκνὰ-κυρτὰ evokes the particular Homeric passage. Posidippus, evidently aware of the scholiastic tradition (*Σ D ad Il.* 13.799 ἄλλα πρὸ ἄλλων, τουτέστιν, ἐπάλληλα, πυκνά, "one after another, i.e., successive, frequent"), chooses to summarize the second part of the Homeric line in the adjective πυκνός—possibly a verbatim reminiscence from the Homeric *scholia*. But the crucial word of the passage is φαληριόωντα; its understanding presupposes fifth-century scholiastic tradition (*Σ D ad Il.* 13.799, cf. *Σ ex. ad Il.* 13.799b): φαληριόωντα: λευκανίζοντα ("whitening").⁴⁴ In sum, Posidippus transfers the foaming waves' quality to the precious stone, explaining indirectly a difficult Homeric *hapax*; as soon as the reader solves this Homeric riddle, the essence of the epigram, the precise nature of this "surreal" gem, becomes evident.

The penultimate *lithikon* (19 AB) is an exceptional case where the use of carefully chosen vocabulary reflects the rich subtext of the epigram. A huge rock washed ashore by the sea waves assumes a supernatural dimension through the reference to the Cyclops story (and indirectly to that of Poseidon) from *Odyssey* 9. As in most of Posidippus' *Lithika*, Homerisms play a prominent role throughout; I here focus on the most striking examples.⁴⁵ The rock is described by strongly marked

⁴² Posidippus does not appear to question the dominant interpretation of the Homeric κελάδων = "sounding, roaring," which is how it usually occurs in post-Homeric poetry, and within the Aristarchean tradition (*Ar. Nu.* 284, *B. Epinicia* 9.65, *Theoc.* 17.92, *A.R.* 1.501, 4.133, *Σ Ariston. ad Il.* 7.133–5a). The confusion between the proper noun (Κελάδων) and the common noun (κελάδων) is recorded in the Homeric *scholia* (Aristarchus read κελάδωντι instead of the hydronym Κελάδων in *Il.* 7.133), and echoed in Callimachus *Dian.* 107 Κελάδοντος ὑπὲρ ποταμοῖο ("over the river Celadon"); see Sistakou (2002: 162–3).

⁴³ Posidippus follows the technical description given by Pliny of the "transparent glistening-white" color of the stone, see Smith (2003: 115).

⁴⁴ Tzetzes, to highlight this subtle meaning, writes λευκὰ φαληριόωντα, probably introducing the gloss of the participle φαληριόωντα, instead of the more correct—in terms of the Homeric parallel—πυκνά; see Bastianini and Galazzi (2001: 124 *ad loc.*).

⁴⁵ For an overall interpretation of the epigram based on the poem's multiple allusions

words which point to several Homeric passages; the exact size, form and kind of this rock emerge only after decoding the relevant Homeric vocabulary. At the beginning Posidippus describes the stone vaguely as a *λᾶας* (1), a term repeated at the end of the epigram; then he calls it a *πέτρῃ*, denoting an extra-large rock (5): *ἡμι]πλεθραῖν...πέτρῃν* (“a rock half a plethron in size”). What follows is a comparison with a well-known Homeric stone: *πέτρῃν,/ τοῦ Πολυφημείου σκαιοτέρῃν θυρεοῦ* (“a rock more gauche than Polyphemus’ door-stone,” 5–6), a direct reference to Odysseus’ encounter with Polyphemus, where *θυρεός* (*Od.* 9.240, 313, 340) stands for a rock used to bar the entrance to the Cyclops’ cave. From the double meaning in *Σ Q ad Od.* 9.240 *θυρεὸν μέγαν] τὸν μοχλόλιθον ἢ τὸν ἐν τῇ διαβάσει σκέποντα καὶ ἀσφαλίζοντα* (“a rock used as a bar for a door or safely sheltering a door’s passage”), Posidippus opts for the second. The precise shape of the rock is further modified by the addition of *σκαιός*. According to scholiastic tradition, this is to be understood either as “western” or “fearful and wild” (*Σ Q ad Od.* 3.295); obviously Posidippus adopts the second meaning, stressing not just the rock’s crude quality, but also indirectly Polyphemus’ brutality.⁴⁶ The next Homerism describing the rock is *γυρὸς ὀλοίτροχος* (9), denoting a rounded stone. This is yet another case where a *glossa* is explained by its near-synonym, thus highlighting the poem’s philological basis. Some scholiasts connected the *hapax* *ὀλοοίτροχος* with *ὀλοός* and *τρέχειν* (“destructively running”), others with *ὄλος* and *τροχός* (“entirely rounded,” *Σ ex. ad Il.* 13.137c, *Σ D ad Il.* 13.137); *γυρός* (“rounded”) is another *hapax*, a *glossa* glossing *ὀλοίτροχος*.⁴⁷ Finally the rock is modified as *τετρακαιεικοσίπηχυς λᾶας* (13), “a stone of twenty-four cubits.” The repetition of *λᾶας* in the first and penultimate line gives to the epigram the typical scheme of *Ringkomposition*. This elaborated arrangement of the key word *λᾶας* leads to the epigram’s witty culmination. *Λᾶας* describes as a rule a stone thrown by warriors in battle; but Posidippus derives his use of

to Homer and Theocritus, see Petrain (2003), from whom I also cite the translation of the passage under discussion.

⁴⁶ For this fine interpretation of *σκαιοτέρῃν* as a comic metaphor of Polyphemus’ temperament, see Petrain (2003: 374–5).

⁴⁷ Recalling not just *Σ B ad Od.* 19.246 *γυρὸς] οὐκ ἐπιμήκης, ἀλλὰ στρογγύλος* “γυρὸς meaning not oblong but spherical”, but also the toponym *Γυραὶ πέτραι* (*Od.* 4.500–1). On the kind of the stone-κύλινδρος and the dependence of the passage on the Homeric simile in *Il.* 13.137–42, see Livrea (2002: 62). A detailed discussion of *γυρὸς ὀλοίτροχος* in Petrain (2003: 365–73).

the term from its application to an extremely heavy boulder carried by superhuman heroes (by Polyphemos *Od.* 9.537 and by Sisyphus *Od.* 11.594)⁴⁸ or to huge objects fossilized by the intervention of a god (*Il.* 2.319, *Od.* 13.161–4). So the rock turns out to be massive (surpassing in size even an island!—see 14, ῥεῖα καταμήσεις εἰν ἀλὶ νῆσον ὅλην, “you would easily mow down an entire island in the sea”), requiring the strength of Poseidon to remove it; the poet has directed us to the pivotal theme of his epigram, the wondrous quality of a rock, through a labyrinth of textual and philological connotations in the epigram’s vocabulary. By exploiting Homer’s terminology on stones, Posidippus creates a learned, self-reflexive epilogue to his collection of *Lithika*.⁴⁹

Evaluating Posidippus as a Homeric scholar is difficult. Presumably familiar with all facets of Alexandrian Homeric philology, he nevertheless most often followed traditional solutions to much disputed Homeric problems, such as those in the fifth-century D scholia. In some of his epigrams, however, he quotes edited versions of the Homeric text, indicating that he knew some interesting variants, for which grammarians like Aristarchus valued his testimony. Yet, the most striking evidence of his philological interest appears in the New Posidippus, where the poet explores various possibilities of integrating Homeric scholarship into erudite poetry. Refined word-play between a *glossa* and a synonym used as its lexicographical explanation, complex philological problems transformed into riddling epigrams, and emphasis on careful arrangement of crucial words—all the characteristics that constitute a proper poetic of *exegesis*—are brilliantly exemplified in Posidippus’ *Lithika*.

Along with Apollonius, Callimachus poeticized Homeric exegesis more than any other Hellenistic poet.⁵⁰ His philological activity is well attested,

⁴⁸ Di Benedetto (2003: 3–5) believes that λᾶας and θυρεός in Posidippus allude to the *Odyssey*; cf. Heubeck and Hoekstra (1989: *ad loc.*). I think that Posidippus is also alluding to *Il.* 12.445–6, “Ἑκτωρ δ’ ἀρπάξας λᾶαν φέρεν, ὅς ῥα πυλάων/ ἐστήκει πρόσθε” (“Hector grasped and bore a stone that lay before the gate”), where a θυρεός is also described; on the close relation between the Iliadic passage and Polyphemos’ rock, see Hainsworth (1993: *ad loc.*). The size of the rock in relation to the supernatural powers of Poseidon and the heroicized Polyphemos are stressed by Hunter in an excellent reading of the epigram in connection with Theocritus *Id.* 6 and 11 (2004b: 100–4).

⁴⁹ The metapoetic character of these epigrams has already been recognized, with the carved stones as a metaphor for elaborated poetry; see Schur (2004).

⁵⁰ On Homeric exegesis by Callimachus see the recent work of Rengakos (1992) and (1993) and Montanari (2002).

as is his profound knowledge of the Homeric text and vocabulary. Homeric rarities, occasionally glossed by synonyms, appear in several epigrams.

Take for instance the epitaph for a young girl, Crethis (37 GP = AP 7.459 = 16 Pf.):

Κρηθίδα τὴν πολύμυθον ἐπισταμένην καλὰ παίζειν
 δίζηται Σαμίων πολλάκι θυγατέρες,
 ἡδίστην συνέριθον ἀείλαλον· ἡ δ' ἀποβρίζει
 ἐνθάδε τὸν πάσαις ὕπνον ὀφειλόμενον.

The daughters of Samos so often miss Crethis, the girl
 of many words, who could play so well,
 their sweetest workmate, so garrulous; but she sleeps
 here the sleep that is fated for all.

The description of Nausicaa in *Odyssey* 6 serves as the main Homeric intertext on which Callimachus relies not just for the girlish behavior of Nausicaa and her friends, but above all for the Homeric *hapax* συνέριθος. At *Odyssey* 6.32, Athena proposes that she will accompany Nausicaa as her συνέριθος (“a helpmate in domestic work”) when she goes to wash her wedding clothes. Immediately thereafter, Callimachus calls the reader’s attention to another Homeric rarity: ἡ δ' ἀποβρίζει (“but she sleeps”), an expression which according to Homeric *scholia* implies “a short nap, never a deep sleep” (Σ ad *Od.* 9.151, 12.7). At first this seems misleading. Crethis’ girlfriends are looking for her; by the use of ἀποβρίζω, Callimachus leads the (learned) reader of the epigram to think that she probably took a short sleep—just as her companions may originally have thought. That is, ἀποβρίζει here focalizes the perspective of Crethis’ playmates as they look for her. But with the last line, this philological path proves a dead end, since Crethis’ nap turns out to be eternal—a metaphor of her own death.⁵¹

Another example is the amatory epigram in which the speaker addresses Menexenus (9 GP = AP 12.139 = 44 Pf.). Here, the first distich gives an erotic twist to the simile of a hidden brand from *Odyssey* 5.488–90. Callimachus’ use of the Homeric *hapax* σποδιή (“embers”) points directly to the Odyssean passage. ἔστι... κεκρυμμένον... πῦρ ὑπὸ

⁵¹ Ἀποβρίζω with its Homeric meaning occurs also in Theocritus’ epitaph for Hipponax (13.4 GP = AP 13.3.4). Cf. Apollonius Sophistes’ entry in *Lexicon Homericum* ἀποβρίζαντες· ἀπονυστάξαντες (“being sleepy and sluggish”).

τῇ σποδιῇ (“there is fire hidden under the embers,” 1–2) picks up *Od.* 5.488–90, ὥς δ’ ὅτε τις δαλὸν σποδιῇ ἐνέκρυψε μελαίνῃ... σπέρμα πυρὸς σῶζων (“as when a man hides a brand under the dark embers... saving a seed of fire”). Indeed, the epigram can be viewed as making explicit the erotic potential of the Odyssean simile, i.e., it interprets the simile as referring to Odysseus’ latent erotic charm, which propels the Nausicaa episode that immediately follows. Next, we get a metaphorical depiction of eros as a river in πολλὰκι λήθει / τοῖχον ὑποτρῶγων ἡσύχιος ποταμός (“often a stream secretly eats away a wall,” 3–4). The adjective ἡσύχιος, a Homeric *hapax*, occurs at *Iliad* 21.598, where Apollo removes Aeneas from the battle, covering him with a cloud: ἡσύχιον δ’ ἄρα μιν πολέμου ἔκπεμπε νέεσθαι (“he sent him forth from the war to go his way in peace”). The Σ ex. ad *Il.* 21.598 note ἡσύχιον: λάθρα, κρυφῇ. ἢ ἀθόρυβον (“ἡσύχιον: secretly, hidden, or quietly”). Callimachus obviously does not use the adjective with its post-Homeric sense “still, quiet,” but refers to its passive use meaning “without being perceived by the rest.” This much is clear from the atmosphere of latent eroticism which prevails in the epigram from the start.

A similar technique appears in the erotic epigram to Epicydes (1 GP = AP 12.102 = 31 Pf.). In lines 1–4 the poet describes a hunting scene; carefully selected vocabulary reflects specific issues of Homeric interpretation. The sense of the Homeric *glossa* στίβη, which Callimachus draws from the *Odyssey* (5.467, 17.5), was widely disputed. The scholiasts differ as to whether it denotes “the morning chill” or “hoarfrost” (Σ ad *Od.* 5.467, Σ ad *Od.* 17.25). Callimachus evidently opts for the second explanation: the setting of a hunter looking for his quarry in the snow presupposes that στίβη and νιφετός are near-synonyms, denoting “frost” and “snow” respectively.⁵² The epigram’s point emerges gradually with the next Homerism, βέβληται. With the phrase ‘τῇ, τόδε βέβληται θηρίον’ (“look, this beast lies wounded,” 4), Callimachus not only reintroduces the Homeric present perfect form βέβληται into poetry, but also reminds us of the term’s technical meaning in the context of Iliadic battle-scenes. As often pointed out in the Homeric *scholia*, βέβληται specifically describes wounding from a distance—so in D *scholia* and in Aristarchus,⁵³ though not in Zenodotus,

⁵² On this Homeric *glossa* in Callimachus, as well as its periphrastic rendition from the *Hecale* fr. 260.64 Pf. = fr. 74.23 H. στίβῃεις ἄγχαυρος, see Rengakos (1992: 37).

⁵³ For his interpretation, see Σ Did. ad *Il.* 11.439a. βέβληται is opposed to οὐτάω in the formula βεβλημένοι οὐτάμενοι τε, explained by Σ D ad *Il.* 13.764 as “some were

who understands it as an equivalent to οὐτάω. Callimachus consciously incorporates the term into a hunting scene in order to stress the fact that the quarry is hit from a long way off. The epigram's ending reveals its actual subject, the poet's insatiable chase of new lovers; the proverbial closing phrase, τὰ μὲν φεύγοντα διώκειν/ οἶδε τὰ δ' ἐν μέσσω κείμενα παρπέταται ("my love seeks only the fleeing game, but flies past what lies in its path," 5–6), emphasizes from a philological perspective the anthithesis between a hit from a long and a short distance, as implied by the peculiar Homeric usage of βέβληται.⁵⁴

Callimachus shares common ground both with the older D *scholia* and the Hellenistic scholarly tradition in general (regarding στίβη, ἡσύχιος), as well as with Aristarchus in the semantic differentiation of βέβληται and οὐτάω.⁵⁵ But what sets him apart from his fellow poets is his intensive use of scholarship for poetic purposes. His mastery as a scholar-poet is everywhere on view: in Crethis' death likened to a Homeric nap through ἀποβρίζω, in the erotic chase of Epicydes filtered through sophisticated commentary on Homerisms, and in the poet's latent passion likened to a Homeric ἡσύχιος ποταμός.

Each of the four early third-century epigrammatists discussed above enters into a dialogue with an early stage of Homeric criticism in different ways, from Simias' unsophisticated approach to Homeric *glossai* to Callimachus' inventive variations upon them, and from Asclepiades' conservatism to Posidippus' bold philological experimentation. Most instances above, perhaps with the exception of Callimachus, reveal the widespread influence of early scholiastic and glossographic tradition, thus setting the early Hellenistic epigrammatists apart from the purely scholarly approach later introduced by Aristarchus.⁵⁶ From a poetological point of view, the engagement of these poets with both

hit from a distance by spear or arrow, while others wounded from near at hand by sword or something similar." However, Apollonius does not make the same distinction; see Rengakos (1994: 64–5).

⁵⁴ Callimachus may be indirectly criticizing Zenodotus with the use of the word ἵχνια (2). In at least one case, Zenodotus and Aristophanes wrote ἵχματα=ἴθματα ("steps") instead of ἵχνια (Σ Did. *ad Il.* 13.71c). The word is current in Hellenistic poetry; see, e.g., Callimachus 54.11 GP; 13.6 GP, A.R. 1.575, and Rhianus 3.9 GP.

⁵⁵ The relevant evidence from the whole of Callimachus' poetic *oeuvre* is evaluated by Rengakos (1992: 31–46).

⁵⁶ Nagy (2004: 57–61) argues that Callimachus and Posidippus represent an early tendency in Homeric criticism which was based on post-Homeric interpretations, and which was condemned by Zenodotus and Aristarchus.

poetry and philology appears in their use of controversial Homerisms for literary aims. Not just Homer, but also Homeric philology, becomes a pervasive and significant intertext for third-century epigram and adds an important dimension to its interpretation.

EPIGRAM AND THE HERITAGE OF EPIC

Annette Harder

1. *Introduction*

Homeric epic and the mythological tradition connected with the ancient epic heroes are an important influence on most subsequent literary genres in Greek literature. In later epics and in Greek tragedy, for instance, plots related to the Trojan War and its pre-history and aftermath are very popular and we see how the later poets continue to draw inspiration from these old stories.¹ But what about epigram? These small poems, with their roots in inscriptions related to issues of the life and death of ordinary people, do not at first seem to have anything in common with epic from the point of view of origin, contents or structure. On the other hand, the poets of epigrams had grown up with Homer and the Homeric tradition. Some of them, like Callimachus and Theocritus, provide ample evidence of their profound knowledge of that kind of poetry, and we may assume that others, too, possessed considerable knowledge of the epic tradition.

Recently the apparent lack of contact between epigram and “bigger” genres has been put to the test in two articles focused on the reception of ancient drama in epigram. Annemarie Ambühl (2002: 9–11) shows that Callimachus 32 GP, about the suicide of Basilo after the burial of her brother Melanippus, can be read as a messenger-speech or an epilogue by the chorus from tragedy and fits in with Aristotle’s observation that a tragedy should cover the events of one day. More specifically she draws attention to the epigram’s similarities with the plot of Sophocles’ *Antigone*, where within the compass of one day Antigone buried her brother Polyneices and committed suicide, and to its use of tragic vocabulary. Anja Bettenworth (2002) considers the scene in Asclepiades 25 GP, where a master gives instructions to a slave to go shopping for a dinner-party, and infers that the scene’s contents owe much to comedy.²

¹ For a recent survey with further references see Hunter (2004a).

² Bettenworth (2002: 37).

These results raise the question whether there is a significant number of epigrams which give evidence of inspiration by other genres and, if so, how this was achieved and which literary genres were involved. A large group of epigrams on poets obviously shows the epigrammatists' interest in other literary genres,³ but does not necessarily incorporate elements of these genres: an epigram on the tomb of, e.g., Homer or Euripides is still a funerary epigram and does not need to be shaped like a miniature epic or a tragic scene.⁴ Even so, there are epigrams which yield to this kind of approach, and an investigation of the material may help to acquire a clearer picture of the history of Greek epigram and its development from inscriptions related to situations in real life to a purely bookish kind of poetry.

While the connections of epigram with several other genres are discussed elsewhere in this volume,⁵ in this article I shall discuss epigrams from GP and GP *Garland* which feature subjects and characters belonging to the realm of myth and connected with epic poetry, and which focus on the heroes and scenes from the Trojan War.⁶ In the course of this article I shall deal with several questions, such as which heroes, characters, towns and subjects feature in the epigrams; which aspects of the epic stories are prominent; in what way ancient epic is evoked and how the epic material is adapted to the new genre; and what the treatment of the epic themes in epigram tells us about the vitality of the epic tradition.

Several groups of epigrams may be distinguished in which the heroes of ancient epic figure prominently, and each forms the subject of a section below: epigrams on the tombs of mythical heroes; ecphrastic epigrams on representations of mythical heroes in visual art;⁷ epigrams

³ The epigrams on poets are not an object of this investigation, but are still important because they show the literary horizon of the epigrammatic poets: the poets mentioned in their poems may also have been those by whom they could be inspired in other ways so as to carry out generic experiments based on their works. For epigrams on poets see in general Gabathuler (1937); see further Acosta-Hughes and Barbantani in this volume.

⁴ On funerary epigrams for Homer see further Bolmarcich (2002).

⁵ See in this volume Rosen (iambic poetry); Fantuzzi (tragedy); Acosta-Hughes and Barbantani (lyric poetry); and Stanzel (bucolic poetry).

⁶ However, the investigation could easily be extended to other groups of myths and to the later epigrams and *adespota* because there is a great deal of material. See, e.g., the epigrams mentioned below in nn. 16, 22, 23, 31, 36 and 38, and the list of speeches by mythical heroes in *AP* 9.457–80.

⁷ On ecphrastic epigrams see also Männlein-Robert in this volume.

about the destruction of a mythical (or historical) town; short narratives about mythical heroes and subjects; short speeches by mythical heroes or heroines; and scenes inspired by epic patterns.

We shall see that there is an increase of elements from outside the original realm of epigrammatic subjects in the course of the history of the genre, as we find considerably more examples of epic elements in the *Garland* of Philip (GP *Garland*) than in the *Garland* of Meleager (GP), and even more may be found among the *adespota* and later epigrams. Apparently epigram was more and more regarded as a short poem in its own right in which the limitations of its inscriptional origin were no longer felt and there was room for generic experiments and a general widening of scope as the genre became more bookish. On the other hand, there is a certain awareness of the need to stay within certain limits, because after all epigrams are just short poems, and therefore we find a certain focus on brief pathetic scenes and famous events, suitable for the genre.

In some cases we shall see direct allusions to Homeric epic, particularly in the early epigrams in GP, which may well be influenced by the literary techniques and use of intertextuality of poets like Callimachus, Apollonius Rhodius and Theocritus and generally show more subtle allusions to Homer than the later epigrams.⁸ Often the epigrams seem to follow the lead of the literary tradition at large, which developed an interest in minor heroes and non-central events of the Trojan War or favored certain themes, like the death of Ajax or the sad fate of Protesilaus. We shall also see that the Trojan material was sometimes used for new purposes in an erotic, literary or political context.

On the whole there is a focus on the essential points of the story: the reader is expected to know the highlights of the epic tradition well and to supplement the information he is given and place it in its proper context. Although the presentation is sometimes foreshadowed in Homer, there is clearly a “reduction” of the epic format: the theme of the fall of Troy, obituary passages, speeches and scenes in Homer are all reduced in such a way as to fit the space allowed by the epigram.

⁸ See Sens and Sistakou in this volume.

2. *Tombs of mythical heroes*

The idea of a tomb for a Homeric hero is already present in *Il.* 7.86–91, where Hector speaks about a tomb the Greeks will build for the man with whom he intends to fight in single combat: “Let them erect a tomb for him on the coast of the broad Hellespont and in the future one of the later-born people, sailing across the wine-colored sea on a big ship, may say: ‘That is the tomb of a man who died long ago, who once fought bravely, but was killed by glorious Hector.’ Thus someone will speak in the future and my fame will never die.” Here the dead man is anonymous (Hector does not yet know that the fight will be with Ajax) and the text is not an inscription commemorating the dead, but the reaction of a passerby, who mentions only the killer by name.⁹ Elsewhere we find short “obituaries” to dead or dying heroes with elements of a funeral inscription, like *Il.* 20.389–92, where Achilles addresses one of his victims, Iphition: “There you are lying, son of Otrynteus, most terrifying of all men. Here you found your death, but you were born on the shores of Lake Gygaea, where your father has his land, near the Hyllus, full of fish, and the winding Hermus.”¹⁰ These passages may have started the notion of fictional tombs for Homeric heroes as an effective and compact means of preserving their fame outside the compass of the large-scale epics.

AP 7.136–50 is a group of funeral epigrams for Homeric heroes. These epigrams are devoted to the well-known heroes from Homer and focus on the more “sympathetic” ones. Thus we find on the Trojan side epigrams for Priam and Hector, but not for Paris; on the Greek side, Achilles, Patroclus, Ajax, Nestor and Protesilaus (the first victim of the war), but not Agamemnon.¹¹

⁹ For further discussion of this passage in relation to the rhetoric of sepulchral epigram see Bing (2002b: 49–50) and the literature referred to in his notes.

¹⁰ For further discussion of the similarities between the obituary passages in the *Iliad* and archaic funerary inscriptions see Griffin (1980: 141–3); on thematic borrowings from Homer in inscribed and book epigrams see, e.g., Ecker (1990: 12–22), Bruss (2005b: 20–3; 34 and 145); and on the ancient notion of Homer as a poet of epigram Markwald (1986). For fictional funerary epigrams cf. also *E.Tr.* 1188–91 (for Astyanax) and see Dinter (2005) (about Homer and Virgil).

¹¹ Unless the lines are part of a longer elegiac poem, another early epigram in this group is Posidippus 48 AB about the hero Pandarus, the son of Lycaon of Zeleia, who was killed by Diomedes in *Il.* 5.290–6 and is here said to be buried on the banks of the river Simoeis.

The oldest datable epigrams in this series are by Asclepiades (third century B.C.) and Antipater of Sidon (second century B.C.) on the tomb of Ajax, who was buried near the mouth of the Hellespont at the promontory of Rhoeteum. Both epigrams refer to the story of how the Greeks cheated Ajax out of the arms of Achilles and gave them to Odysseus instead.¹² The story referred to in these epigrams became famous through the treatment of Sophocles in his *Ajax* and recurs in, e.g., *Ov. Met.* 12.620–13.398, but was based on the early epic tradition, where we first find it in *Od.* 11.543–67. In Asclepiades 29 GP (= *AP* 7.145) the speaker is Arete (“Virtue”), with her locks cut off, who is mourning the fact that for the Greeks fraud and treachery are more powerful than she is:

“Ἀδ’ ἐγὼ ἂ τλάμων Ἀρετὰ παρὰ τῷδε κάθημαι
 Αἴαντος τύμβῳ κειρομένα πλοκάμους,
 θυμὸν ἄχει μεγάλῳ βεβολημένα, εἰ παρ’ Ἀχαιοῖς
 ἂ δολόφρων Ἀπάτα κρέσσον ἐμεῦ δύναται.

Here I am, unhappy Virtue, sitting at the tomb
 of Ajax with my locks shorn,
 struck by great sadness in my heart, if truly treacherous
 Deceit has more power with the Achaeans than I.

Similarly in Antipater of Sidon 7 GP (= *AP* 7.146) Arete is sitting at Ajax’ tomb with unkempt hair and dirty clothes, mourning the victory of fraud over virtue:

Σῆμα παρ’ Αἰάντειον ἐπὶ Ῥοιτησίῃσι κατὰ
 θυμοβαρὴς Ἀρετὰ μύρομαι ἐζομένα,
 ἀπλόκαμος, πινόεσσα, διὰ κρίσιν ὅτι Πελασγῶν
 οὐκ ἄρετὰ νικᾶν ἔλλαχεν, ἀλλὰ δόλος.
 τεύχεα δ’ ἂν λέξειεν Ἀχιλλεύος· Ἄρσενος ἀκμᾶς,
 οὐ σκολιῶν μύθων ἄμμες ἐφίεμεθα.

Sitting at the tomb of Ajax on the coast of Rhoeteum
 I, Virtue, am mourning with a heavy heart,
 with my hair cut, and dirty, because as a result of the judgment
 of the Pelasgians not virtue, but treachery was victorious.
 The armor of Achilles might say: “We are longing
 for masculine courage, not for crooked words.”

¹² Asclepiades’ epigram may have influenced an epigram by Posidippus on a Trojan Berisus, whose death is perhaps recorded in *Il.* 11.101 (Posidippus 144 AB), but the evidence is too scanty for conclusions; see also Gutzwiller (1998b: 170); Nagy (2004: 61–4).

However, after the moralizing passage which is rather similar to Asclepiades, the last two lines offer a kind of comfort when the armor of Achilles is presented as saying that it longs for masculine courage, i.e., for Ajax, and not for crooked words, i.e., not for the treacherous Odysseus. This quotation may refer to the story that, after Odysseus was shipwrecked, the waves carried Achilles' arms to the tomb of Ajax.¹³ In both epigrams the moral indignation about the Greeks' behavior is strong and explicit. In Archias 16 GP *Garland* (= AP 7.147), however, the story is presented somewhat differently:

Μοῦνος ἐναιρομένοισιν ὑπέρμαχος ἀσπίδα τείνας
 νηυσὶ βαρὺν Τρώων, Αἴαν, ἔμεινας ἄρη·
 οὐδέ σε χερμαδίων ὤσεν κτύπος, οὐ νέφος ἰῶν,
 οὐ πῦρ, οὐ δοράτων, οὐ ξιφέων πάταγος·
 ἀλλ' αὐτῶς προβλής τε καὶ ἔμπεδος ὥς τις ἐρίπνα
 ἰδρυθεὶς ἔτλης λαίλαπα δυσμενέων.
 εἰ δέ σε μὴ τεύχεσσιν Ἀχιλλέος ὥπλισεν Ἑλλάς
 ἄξιον ἄντ' ἀρετᾶς ὅπλα ποροῦσα γέρας,
 Μοιράων βουλῇσι τάδ' ἄμπλακεν, ὥς ἂν ὑπ' ἐχθρῶν
 μή τινος, ἀλλὰ σὺ σῇ πότμον ἔλῃς παλάμη.

Alone you held your champion shield before the dying,
 Ajax, and withstood the Trojans' fighting, so heavy upon the ships;
 nor rattle of stones drove you back, nor cloud of arrows,
 nor fire, nor din of spears and swords.
 But even so, firm-fixed as a cliff, standing forward
 and steadfast, you endured the hurricane of your foes.
 If Hellas armed you not in the harness of Achilles,
 giving you the weapons that were the honor worthy of your valor,
 she erred thus by the will of the Fates; that you might take
 your doom from no enemy, but at your own hand.¹⁴

Here Ajax is addressed, with no reference any longer to a tomb or other conventionally epigrammatic monument, by an anonymous speaker, who in 1–6 praises the way in which Ajax defended the Greeks against the Trojans. In this passage we find a number of Homeric words and an allusion to *Il.* 17.747–53, where both Ajaxes are compared to a mountain-range withstanding the floods,¹⁵ so that an epic atmosphere is clearly evoked. Then in 7–10 the speaker explains that the Greeks did not give Ajax the arms of Achilles, as he deserved, because the Fates wanted Ajax to die not by the hand of an enemy, but by his own, a

¹³ See Gow-Page (1965: 2.40).

¹⁴ Translations from GP *Garland* are by Gow-Page (adapted to American spelling).

¹⁵ See Gow-Page (1968: 2.442).

notion which recalls Ov. *Met.* 13.390 *ne quisquam Aiace[m] possit superare nisi Ajax* ("so that no one can beat Ajax except Ajax").¹⁶ Here the moderate and slightly cryptic comfort of Antipater's poem has been increased and turned into an encomiastic passage in which Ajax' epic glory is brought to the reader's attention by the poet's careful phrasing.

It is striking that apart from the characters who are well-known from Homer we also find a series of epigrams on the death of the Greek hero Protesilaus, who died as the first victim in the war (*Il.* 2.695–710). His death caused great distress for his wife Laodamia and was also a topic in the elegiac works of later poets like Ovid (who let Laodamia write a worried letter to her husband in *Her.* 13) and Catullus (68.73–86). The popularity of the theme in Latin poets suggests that the subject may also have been explored by Hellenistic poets and its treatment in epigram may be related to that.¹⁷ In Antiphilus 23 *GP Garland* (= *AP* 7.141) and Philip 33 *GP Garland* (= *AP* 7.385), however, the focus is not on Laodamia; rather, the Thessalian Protesilaus is addressed and the elms which surround his tomb are said to drop their leaves when they grow high enough to look at Troy, thus carrying on the anger of the deceased against Troy.¹⁸ Thus the poets of epigram seem to favor an "epic" rather than an "elegiac" approach to the death of Protesilaus.

Among the Trojan heroes Hector is mentioned, but we cannot trace a series of interacting epigrams as in the case of Ajax. In Archias 15 *GP Garland* (= *AP* 7.140) we find a brief dialogue in which a speaker asks about the father, name, country and cause of death of the deceased and is duly informed that this tomb is for Hector, the son of Priam of Troy, who died fighting for his country.¹⁹ Similarly Antipater of Thessalonica 55 *GP Garland* (= *AP* 7.136) mentions the tomb of Priam,

¹⁶ In epigram this notion is carried on in *adespota* *AP* 7.148 and Leontius Scholasticus *AP* 7.149. In Leontius Scholasticus *AP* 7.150 the emphasis is different, as Ajax is said to have died not through his enemies, but through his friends.

¹⁷ The story was apparently famous and is well-attested elsewhere, too; see Gow-Page (1968: 2.131) on Antiphilus 23 *GP Garland*.

¹⁸ The other epigrams for Greek heroes in *AP* 7.142, 143 and 144 (for Achilles, Patroclus and Nestor, respectively) add little of interest. In Antipater of Thessalonica 5 *GP Garland* and *AP* 7.157 Nestor's long life is contrasted with that of the speaker, who is content to live just over three decades.

¹⁹ The other epigrams in *AP* 7.137–9 praise Hector in various ways, but do not suggest "discussion" as in the case of Ajax: Anon. *AP* 7.137 refers to Hector's humble tomb and states that his true tomb (or rather memorial) are the *Iliad*, Homer himself, Greece and the fleeing Achaeans; Aceratus Grammaticus *AP* 7.138 invokes Hector and states that with his death Homer ended the *Iliad*; *AP* 7.139.1–2 recalls how Troy perished together with Hector and was no longer able to fight the Greeks when he had died.

and states that it is only small, because it was raised by enemies.

In summary, one may say that the most interesting epigrams in this group are those about Ajax, which seem to reflect an ongoing discussion on his suicide, and about Protesilaus, which fit in with the post-Homeric tradition that privileges “minor” heroes from the *Iliad* and minor or non-central events of the Trojan War.²⁰ Although one should be careful in drawing far-reaching conclusions on the basis of this small group of epigrams and further investigation would be necessary, it looks as if the epigrammatic tradition followed the example of other literary genres,²¹ which had problematized the fate of Ajax and drawn attention to the early death of Protesilaus, rather than to have elaborated Homeric themes of its own accord.

3. *Ecphrastic epigrams*

There is a group of ecphrastic epigrams about representations of mythical heroes in visual art, from various realms of myth, local as well as pan-Hellenic.²² Occasionally the epigrams describe representations of characters also known from epic, and the texts show a certain debt to Homer as well as to the way a scene may have been rendered in visual art.²³

Thus in Posidippus 64 AB a bronze statue of Idomeneus is praised, and Idomeneus’ address to Meriones, in which he urges him to run, is quoted:²⁴

αἵ]νέε γ’ Ἰδομενῆα θέλων χάλκειον ἐκείν[ον
 Κρησίλα· ὥς ἄκρως ἠργάσατ’ εἶδομέν εὔ·
 γ]αυρὺ[ει] Ἰδομενεύς· “ἀλ[λ’] ὦ γὰρθὲ Μηριόνα, θεῖ,
] πλάσται δὲν [ἀδό]νητος ἐών.”

²⁰ See also Harder (2003: 297–8); and for the Hellenistic interest in the “Homeric periphery” on a textual level, Nagy (2004: 57–64).

²¹ See the references to tragic, epic and elegiac treatments earlier in this section.

²² E.g., Poena and Coroebus in *AP* 7.154; Heracles and Thiodamas in *AP* 16.101 (see Gutzwiller (2002a: 104–5)); Polyphemus in Metrodorus *AP* 14.132; Medea in Antiphilus 48 *GP Garland*; Perseus and Andromeda in Antiphilus 49 *GP Garland*. On ecphrastic epigrams, see Männlein-Robert in this volume.

²³ For a similarly complex relation with visual art and tragedy, cf. Meleager 128 *GP*, which describes Niobe in a scene which may recall Sophocles’ *Niobe*; see Gutzwiller (2002a: 107–9).

²⁴ For this pair of Cretan heroes cf., e.g., *Il.* 2.645–52; 7.165–6.

[Praise] without stint that famous bronze Idomeneus
 of Cresilas. How he worked perfectly we saw very well.
 Idomeneus [cries out]: “Come, my good Meriones, run
 [...] being motionless for so long.”²⁵

In this epigram the statue is presented as so true to life that one can hear Idomeneus crying out and this notion is underlined by the use of the Doric dialect as befits the Cretan hero.²⁶ In addition to this visual representation, the poem also evokes the literary tradition. The words εἶδομεν εἶ in 2 acoustically echo the name Idomeneus and may well be an allusion to a possible instance of wordplay with the name of Idomeneus and the verb μένω in *Il.* 13.476, ὥς μένεω Ἰδομενεὺς δουρικλυτός, οὐδ’ ὑπεχώρει (“in a similar way Idomeneus, famous for his spear, stood firmly and did not yield”). Idomeneus’ words in lines 3–4 recall his exhortations of Meriones in *Il.* 13.249–50 and 477–86.²⁷ The readers’ attention is thus drawn to the presentation of Idomeneus in early epic and they are invited to appreciate Posidippus’ variation of the presumed Homeric wordplay, while the words δᾶν [ἀδῶ]νητος ἐὼν in 4 call attention to the long span of time between such Homeric exhortations and the present-day “revival” of Idomeneus and Meriones through Cresilas and (implicitly) Posidippus.

In Glaucus 3 GP *Garland* a painting of the suffering Philoctetes by Parrhasius is briefly described and the painter is reproached for not giving Philoctetes a rest from his pain. This episode is briefly narrated in *Il.* 2.721–5, where Philoctetes is described as μοχθίζοντα (723, “suffering”), which may have inspired Glaucus’ πολύμοχθον (6, “long-suffering”). However, as the theme was treated at length in tragedies by Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides, its first association may have been with tragedy (see also section 2 above).

Elsewhere, epigrams describe other striking scenes from the epic tradition as they were treated in visual art. Thus the Trojan horse is described in an ecphrastic epigram in Antiphilus 35 GP *Garland*, which invites the reader to look at the Trojan horse, made by Epeius according to Athena’s instructions and filled with the armed Greeks, waiting in silence. The epigram ends with a moralizing remark in 5–6: “Truly in

²⁵ Translations of Posidippus are taken from the edition of Austin-Bastianini (2002). Here in line 1 instead of “without stint” one might prefer something like “gladly” or “willingly” for θέλων.

²⁶ See on this aspect of the poem Sens (2004: 75–6).

²⁷ This evidence was already adduced by Bastianini and Gallazzi (2001: 190).

vain that great army perished, if deceit was better than battle for the Atreidae in their war.” This view of the end of the Trojan War recalls the presentation of the events in Simias’ *Axe*, a pattern poem posing as an epigram commemorating Epeius’ dedication to Athena of the axe with which he made the Trojan horse. Simias’ poem draws attention to a character mentioned only a few times in Homer²⁸ and “not counted among the main warriors of the Achaeans” (5, οὐκ ἐνάρηθμος γεγαῶς ἐν προμάχοις Ἀχαιῶν). Thus the poem suggests that it was an artisan rather than a great hero who eventually caused the fall of Troy.

In Antipater of Thessalonica 85 GP *Garland* a picture of the underworld by the Athenian painter Nicias describes itself, telling how Homer first explored Hades and how his description was the source for the picture. The exact contents of the painting cannot be reconstructed,²⁹ but clearly the source referred to is Odysseus’ visit to the underworld in the eleventh book of the *Odyssey*.³⁰

As with the funerary epigrams we may observe here, too, that the relation with epic is not direct. The poets draw their inspiration from real or imagined representations of epic scenes in visual art and refer to those rather than to the text of Homer. The only exception seems to be Posidippus 64 AB, where the reference to visual art is combined with allusions to the *Iliad*, so that the reader’s attention is drawn to both the statue and its literary pre-text. The attention given to Epeius in Simias’ *Axe* and Antiphilus 35 GP *Garland* fits in with the observations about the Hellenistic interest in minor heroes in section 2.

²⁸ Cf. *Il.* 23.664–76 and 838–40; *Od.* 8.492–3 and 11.523. The story of the wooden horse becomes more important in the post-Homeric tradition and we find it, e.g., in Poseidon’s description of the fall of Troy in Euripides’ *Troades* 9–14, where line 11, ἐκύμον’ . . . τευχέων (“pregnant with arms” of the horse filled with armed men), foreshadows phrases like Antiphilus’ line 2 εὐόπλου Δαναῶν ἔγκυνον ἥσυχίης (“pregnant with the Greeks’ armed silence”); for more examples see Gow-Page (1968: 2.136)).

²⁹ See Gow-Page (1968: 2.87).

³⁰ In an epigram of unknown date, Metrodorus *AP* 14.132, there is a description of a fountain with a statue of Polyphemus which sheds water from its single eye, its mouth and one of its hands, and the “passerby” is asked to calculate how much time the fountain needs to fill the basin. Here no meaningful relation to the story of the Cyclops in the *Odyssey* can be detected, and the monster’s grim, man-eating character which was prominent in Homer has been turned to a different use. For another epigram on Polyphemus, cf. Posidippus 19 AB (discussed in section 7).

4. *The destruction of Troy and Mycene*

In the *Iliad* the fall of Troy is foreshadowed in several passages and, although the city is still standing at the end of the work, we get hints that the demise of the once prosperous and powerful city has already begun. Thus Hector reflects on the city's rich past and the loss of its treasures in *Il.* 18.288–92 and Achilles reminds Priam of the loss of his former power and wealth in 24.543–8. In tragedy the idea of the fall of Troy is particularly prominent in Euripides' *Troades*, where we find it powerfully expressed all through the play, starting with Poseidon's observations in the prologue in, e.g., lines 8–9 and 15–6.

This notion recurs in several epigrams. A considerable group deals with the destruction of once powerful cities, and among these the epic Troy and Mycene figure prominently.³¹ In most of these epigrams the story of Troy does not figure in its own right, but is part of another kind of discourse, which may be erotic, political or of a meta-literary nature.

The first of the epigrams which deal with the destruction of Troy is by Dioscorides, who probably wrote in the late third century B.C. In 2 GP (= *AP* 5.138) he tells how a woman sang about the Trojan horse and the destruction of Troy and how not only Troy, but he himself as well went up in flames:

Ἴππον Ἀθήνιον ᾗσεν ἐμοὶ κακόν· ἐν πυρὶ πᾶσα
 Ἴλιος ᾗν, καὶ γὰρ κείνη ἄμ' ἐφλεγόμαν,
 †οὐδείσας† Δαναῶν δεκέτη πόνον· ἐν δ' ἐνὶ φέγγει
 τῷ τότε καὶ Τρῶες καὶ γὰρ ἀπωλόμεθα.

Athenium sang for me about the evil horse: Troy
 was completely on fire, and I was on fire with it,
 †...† the ten years' effort of the Danaans; but in that
 single day from the past the Trojans and I perished together.

Here the notion of the fire of Troy serves a double purpose because it allows the poet's play with the notion of the fire of love, kindled by

³¹ The *GA* contains quite a number of epigrams on ruined cities by various poets; cf., e.g., for Mycene *AP* 9.28, 101, 102, 103, 104 (including Argos); Thebes *AP* 9.216, 250, 253; Corinth *AP* 7.297; 9.151, 284; Ephesus *AP* 9.424; Sardes *AP* 9.423; Beirut *AP* 9.425, 426, 427, 500, 501; and for the ruins of Amphipolis *AP* 7.705. Other epigrams focus on desolate landscapes, like *AP* 7.723, and deserted islands, like *AP* 9.408 and 421.

the woman who is singing. Thus the epic story has been transformed and become part of the poetic imagery in an erotic context.

Sometimes the story of Troy is also made part of the contemporary discourse of the later poets. Thus the notion of the destruction of Troy is turned upside down in *Alpheus* 10 *GP Garland* (= *AP* 9.104), where the once famous towns of Greece, like Argos and Mycene, are blamed for destroying the fame of their heroes and described as no more than cattle-stalls, while Troy lives on and has turned out to be the stronger city in the end:

Ἄργος, Ὀμηρικὲ μῦθε καὶ Ἑλλάδος ἱερὸν οὐδας,
καὶ χρυσέη τὸ πάλαι Περσέος ἀκρόπολι,
ἐσβέσαθ' ἡρώων κείνων κλέος, οἳ ποτε Τροίης
ἤρειψαν κατὰ γῆς θεϊόδομον στέφανον.
ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν κρείσσων ἐστὶν πόλις· αἱ δὲ πεσοῦσαι
δείκνυσθ' εὐμύκων αὖλια βουκολίων.

Argos, Homeric legend, and holy soil of Hellas,
and once-golden acropolis of Perseus,
you have extinguished the fame of those heroes who of old
brought low to the ground Troy's god-built coronal.
The stronger city is Troy: you who have fallen
are pointed at as stalls of lowing cattle.

In a similar vein in *Mundus* 1 *GP Garland* (= *AP* 9.103) Mycene complains about its destruction and tells how it was once famous and is now a pasture for various animals, while Troy has been avenged and lives on as a city. Although the dates of both poets are not known, these epigrams may have a political dimension, as Troy had been specially favored by Julius Caesar.³² A more explicitly Roman dimension is added by Bassus, who in 6 *GP Garland* (= *AP* 9.236) contrasts the destruction of Troy, symbolized by the death of its king Priam, with the origin of Rome:

Ἀρρηκτοὶ Μοιρῶν πυμάτην ἐσφράγισαν ὄρκοι
τῷ Φρυγὶ πᾶρ βωμῷ τὴν Πριάμου θυσίην·
ἀλλὰ σοί, Αἰνεία, στόλος ἱερὸς Ἴταλὸν ἦδη
ὄρμον ἔχεν, πάτρης φροῖμιον οὐρανίης.
ἐς καλὸν ὤλετο πύργος ὁ Τρώϊος· ἡ γὰρ ἐν ὅπλοις
ἡγέρθη κόσμου παντὸς ἄνασσα πόλις.

Unbreakable oaths of Destiny set their seal
on the last sacrifice, that of Priam, beside the Phrygian altar.

³² See Str. 13.1.27 (594–5c). On Caesar and Troy see also Wick (2004) on Lucan *BC* 9.950–99 (who also discusses the topos of ruined cities).

But your holy fleet, Aeneas, was already finding anchorage
 in Italy, a prelude to your home in heaven.
 It is well that the towers of Troy perished, for a city
 that is queen of the whole world arose in arms.

By emphasizing that while Priam was dying his countryman Aeneas set foot on Italian soil as a prelude to the foundation of Rome, the epigram fits in with the view of the origins of Rome as expressed in Virgil's *Aeneid* and with the Roman theme in another of Bassus' epigrams, 5 *GP Garland* (= *AP* 7.391), on the death of Germanicus in A.D. 19. We get a glimpse here of a poet from the environment of the imperial court adapting a Roman interpretation of the Trojan War to the genre of epigram.³³

Elsewhere the destruction of Troy is used to phrase a statement about the poetic tradition. Thus in Euenus 2 *GP Garland* (= *AP* 9.62; specific date unknown) the ruined Troy addresses passing strangers and mentions its destruction in the course of time, but then by way of contrast tells how in Homer it is still standing and will never be destroyed by the arms of the Achaeans, and how, in fact, the Greeks will speak about it forever. The emphasis here is very much on the immortality of Homer's poetry.³⁴ A similar comfort is expressed more briefly in Pompeius 2 *GP Garland* (= *AP* 9.28) where the ruined Mycene thus comforts itself. These epigrams reflect the notion of the survival of fame by means of poetry as against the impermanence of monuments, which is also familiar from other texts like, e.g., Simonides *PMG* 581 and Callimachus fr. 64 Pf.

Sometimes no explicit context is added to the presentation of the destroyed city and we see merely a contrast between past fame and present desolation, as in Alpheus 9 *GP Garland* (= *AP* 9.90) about the deserted ruins of Mycene, once rich in gold and surrounded by the well-known Cyclopean walls.³⁵

The vitality of the theme of the destruction of Troy is evident from the fact that in a series of epigrams, *AP* 9.152–5, it is dealt with again

³³ In a similar way *AP* 9.387 (attributed to the emperor Hadrian or to Germanicus) comforts Hector in the underworld by telling him that Troy is inhabited again and that the Myrmidons are dead and by ordering him to tell Achilles that Thessaly is now ruled by the descendants of Aeneas.

³⁴ For further discussion of the importance of Homer for lending the poets of epigram a sense of identity and a position within the literary tradition see Bolmarcich (2002).

³⁵ For similar epigrams on other towns see Gow-Page (1968: 2.428).

several times by Agathias in the sixth century A.D., where the notion of lasting fame recurs in 153 and the notion of the power of Rome as founded by Aeneas in 155. In *AP* 9.152 and 154 the destroyed city speaks. It curses Epeius (in 152) and Paris (in 154) and recalls the outlines of the epic tradition: ten years of war, ended by the deceit of the Trojan horse, and the judgment of Paris, in which an apple is mentioned as the ultimate cause of the city's destruction.

Taken together, this group of epigrams seems to thematize the perspective of later generations and shows an awareness of the huge lapse of time and of the historical changes which had taken place since the times of the Trojan War. This view of the effects of the passing of time was not limited to epigram, but is also found elsewhere, as in *Ov. Met.* 15.420–35 about the rise and fall of peoples and the destruction of once powerful cities like Troy and Mycene, which are now mere ruins, while on the banks of the Tiber Rome is rising. Comparable, too, is the description of Caesar's visit to the ruins of Troy in *Lucan BC* 9.950–99.

5. *Narratives about mythical heroes and subjects*

Sometimes epigrams contain brief narratives about characters or scenes familiar from the Greek epic.³⁶ The aftermath of the Trojan War with its stories of shipwreck and disasters for the Greeks on their journey home is dealt with in two epigrams about the revenge for the treacherous death of Palamedes. Bassus 8 *GP Garland* (= *AP* 9.279) contains an address to the rocks at Cape Caphereus, where Palamedes' father Nauplius had lit a beacon to mislead the Greeks and caused their ships to be wrecked on the coast. The epigram contains no explicit moral judgment, but ends with an address to Nauplius as the cause of tears

³⁶ Other mythological subjects are also well-attested in Greek epigrams and would probably be worth further investigation. Thus we find epigrams about Heracles in Damagetus 12 *GP*; Archias 32 *GP Garland*; the Temenids in Dioscorides 36 *GP*; Hero and Leander in Antipater of Thessalonica 11 *GP Garland*; Medea in Antipater of Thessalonica 29 *GP Garland*, Antiphrilos 48 *GP Garland*, Philip 70 and 71 *GP Garland*; the sons of Oedipus in Antiphrilos 27 *GP Garland*, Bianor 6 *GP Garland*; the Danaids in Argentarius 31 *GP Garland*; the loves of Zeus in Bassus 1 *GP Garland*; Zeus and Danae in Parmenion 1 and 2 *GP Garland*; Salmoneus in Geminus 6 *GP Garland*; Theban myth in Honestus 3 and 6 *GP Garland*, Philip 45 *GP Garland*; Phaedra and Hippolytus in Parmenion 7 *GP Garland*.

for Greece. In Crinagoras 2 GP *Garland* (= AP 9.429), a woman sings about Nauplius and the speaker tells how the flames kindled by him at the rocks of Caphereus pass into his own heart. The erotic twist the epic theme is given here recalls Dioscorides 2 GP about the flames of Troy.

Among the *adespota* we find two epigrams which deal with the scene in *Il.* 7.303–5, where Hector gives his sword to Ajax; and Ajax, his belt to Hector. *AP* 7.151 describes the scene briefly in two lines, but *AP* 7.152³⁷ is more elaborate and tells how the sword caused Ajax' death when he had gone mad and how the belt served to bind Hector to Achilles' chariot when he was dragged around until he found his death (unlike the situation in the *Iliad*, where he is dragged around *after* his death). The epigram recalls Sophocles *Ajax* 661–6 about Ajax dying by Hector's sword and particularly 1028–39 (even if not authentic), where the death of both heroes by their mutual gifts is discussed. Like the passages from the *Ajax*, the epigram points out the irony of these gifts of friendship being instrumental in both heroes' death and within a brief compass conveys something of the tragedy of war.

Again one may notice that the epigrams tend to focus on events which were prominent in the post-Homeric tradition: Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides had written plays about Palamedes (on Ajax' death see section 2 above).

6. *Speeches by mythical characters*

Sometimes we find short speeches by mythical characters in epigrams. There are no examples of these in the early Hellenistic epigrams, but GP *Garland* contains some interesting examples. There is also a series of short speeches by mythical heroes and heroines in specific situations which to a large extent are familiar from the Greek epic in *AP* 9.457–80, where they are presented as direct speech without further introduction.³⁸ It would be worth investigating these speeches, which are reminiscent of rhetorical school exercises, further, but they fall outside the scope of this volume.

³⁷ This epigram has been attributed to Antiphilus by Stadtmüller, but his arguments, based on the vocabulary, are not very strong; see Waltz (1928–94: 4.118).

³⁸ Cf., e.g., Anon. *AP* 9.457 (Achilles to Agamemnon, wounded by Hector); Anon. *AP* 9.458 (Odysseus after his return to Ithaca).

In Antipater of Thessalonica 111 GP *Garland* (= AP 9.77) Hera, jealous because of Ganymede, threatens Troy:

Πριομένα κάλλει Γανυμήδεος εἶπέ ποθ' Ἥρα
 θυμοβόρον ζάλου κέντρον ἔχουσα νόφ·
 Ἄρσεν πῦρ ἔτεκεν Τροία Δί· τοιγὰρ ἐγὼ πῦρ
 πέμψω ἐπὶ Τροία, πῆμα φέροντα Πάριν·
 ἥξει δ' Ἰλιάδαις οὐκ ἀετός, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ θοίαναν
 γῦπες, ὅταν Δαναοὶ σκύλα φέρωσι πόνων.

Vexed by the beauty of Ganymede, with a soul-consuming
 sting of jealousy in her mind, thus Hera spoke one day:
 "Troy bore for Zeus a flame in a male's guise; therefore shall I
 send a flame against Troy, Paris, to bring her woe.
 There shall come to the sons of Ilus no eagle but vultures
 to the feasts, when Danaans carry off the booty of their toils."

Though brief, the epigram encompasses the outline of the story of the Trojan War by mentioning its origin³⁹ and its outcome, and hints at the way in which humans are subject to the whims and the caprices of the gods, a theme which is prominent in the *Iliad*. The reader is obviously expected to know the story and its main issues already and to be able to fill in all the missing elements.

In Flaccus 6 GP *Garland* (= AP 9.117) we find a lament of Hecuba introduced by a brief description of the situation, as in Antipater of Thessalonica 111 GP *Garland*:

Πένθιμον ἠνίκα πατρὶ Πολυξείνης ὑμέναιον
 ἦνυσεν ὀγκωτοῦ Πύρρος ὑπερθε τάφου,
 ὧδε πολυκλαύτοιο κόμας λακίσασα καρήνου
 Κισσηῖς τεκέων κλαῦσε φόνους Ἑκάβη·
 Πρόσθε μὲν ἄξονίοις φθιτὸν εἵρυσας Ἑκτορα δεσμοῖς,
 νῦν δὲ Πολυξείνης αἶμα δέχηι φθίμενος·
 Αἰακίδη, τί τοσοῦτον ἐμὴν ὠδύσσω νηδύν;
 παισὶν ἔφης γὰρ ἐμοῖς ἥπιος οὐδὲ νέκυς.

When Pyrrhus fulfilled in his father's honor that mournful
 marriage to Polyxena above the high-piled tomb,
 thus Hecuba the daughter of Cisseus lamented her children's slaughter,
 rending the hair from her head of many sorrows:

³⁹ It is not known where this version of the origin of the Trojan War stems from. In early Greek epic, *Il.* 20.231–5 and *h. Ven.* 202–17 tell about the abduction of Ganymede, but do not relate it to the Trojan War. In Euripides *Troades* 821–58 the abduction of Ganymede and Tithonus is related to the Trojan War, but in a different way: their presence among the gods could not prevent the destruction of Troy.

First you dragged Hector dead in axle-bonds,
 now in your grave you receive the blood of Polyxena.
 Son of Aeacus, why were you so enraged against my motherhood?
 Not even your corpse has mercy on my children.

The epigram recalls Achilles' treatment of the body of Hector in the *Iliad* as well as the story of the death of Polyxena, which was told in the *Cypria* and the *Iliupersis* and treated at length in Euripides' *Hecuba* as well as in Latin authors.⁴⁰ So again we see that epigram focuses on the events which were prominent in the post-Homeric tradition.

7. *Scenes Inspired by Epic Patterns*

The last group of poems to be discussed here is a group of epigrams in which an epic scene may have formed the model for a contemporary scene and where awareness of the allusions may help contribute further layers of meaning to the epigram, by adding pathos or humor.

Thus in Antipater of Sidon 25 GP (= AP 7.241) about the death of a Ptolemaic prince an epic pattern may be detected:

Μυρία τοι, Πτολεμαῖε, πατήρ, ἔπι, μυρία μάτηρ
 τειρομένα θαλεροῦς ἠκίσατο πλοκάμους·
 πολλὰ τιθηνητὴρ ὀλοφύρατο, χερσὶν ἀμήσας
 ἀνδρομάχοις δνοφερὰν κρατὸς ὑπερθε κόνιν·
 ἃ μεγάλα δ' Αἴγυπτος ἐὰν ὠλόψατο χαίταν,
 καὶ πλατὺς Εὐρώπας ἐστονάχησε δόμος·
 καὶ δ' αὐτὰ διὰ πένθος ἀμαυρωθεῖσα Σελάνα
 ἄστρο καὶ οὐρανίας ἀτραπιτοὺς ἔλιπεν.
 ὦλεο γὰρ διὰ λοιμόν, ὅλας θοινήτορα χέρσου,
 πρὶν πατέρων νεαρῶ σκᾶπτρον ἐλεῖν παλάμα·
 οὐδέ σε νῦξ ἐκ νυκτὸς ἐδέξατο· δὴ γὰρ ἄνακτας
 τοίους οὐκ Αἶδας, Ζεὺς δ' ἐς Ὀλυμπον ἄγει.

Endless, Ptolemaeus, was your father's distress for you, endless
 your mother's, who destroyed her abundant locks;
 your tutor cried a great deal, heaping dark dust upon his head
 with his fighter's hands;
 and great Egypt tore at its hair
 and the wide home of Europa sighed;
 and the moon herself went dim because of mourning
 and left the stars and the paths of heaven.

⁴⁰ See Harder (2001: 83–4), *s.v.* Polyxene.

For you died of the plague, which devoured the whole mainland,
 before you could take your fathers' sceptre in your youthful hand;
 but not did night take you over from night; for lords like you
 are not taken by Hades, but Zeus brings them to Olympus.

In this epigram, lines 3–4 about the tutor heaping dust on his head in mourning recall *Il.* 18.23–4, where Achilles mourns the death of Patroclus. In addition, the whole scene in this epigram recalls the reactions in Troy at the death of Hector in *Il.* 22.405–11: 1–2 about the mother tearing out her hair recalls *Il.* 22.405–6, where Hecuba tears at her hair; the focus on the parents and the tutor in 1–4 recalls *Il.* 22.405–8, where the wailing first of Hecuba and then of Priam is described; then the scope widens in 5–8 and we hear how the whole of Egypt, the home of Europa (i.e., Phoenicia), and even the moon took part in the mourning, which seems to outdo *Il.* 22.408–11, where the people of Troy join in with the laments of Hector's parents and the situation is compared to what it would be like if the whole city was destroyed by fire. By implication the mourning for the Ptolemaic prince is raised to an epic level and the allusions to the heroes of the past seem to help to enhance his status.

We find a more frivolous approach in Antiphanes 1 GP *Garland* (= *AP* 6.88):

Αὐτὴ σοι Κυθήρεια τὸν ἱμερόεντ' ἀπὸ μαστῶν,
 Ἰνώ, λυσαμένη κεστὸν ἔδωκεν ἔχειν,
 ὥς ἂν θελξινόοισιν ἀεὶ φίλτροισι δαμάζῃς
 ἀνέρας· ἐχρήσω δ' εἰς ἐμὲ πᾶσι μόνον.

Ino, the Cytherean herself loosed from her breasts
 the magic cincture of desire and gave it to you to keep,
 that by its heart-enchancing charms you might subdue men
 evermore; yet against me you have used them, every one.

This epigram about Aphrodite lending her *cestus* to a girl called Ino, so that the speaker is subdued by her charms, recalls *Il.* 14.214–23, where Aphrodite lends her *cestus* to Hera to seduce Zeus and put him to sleep. Particularly 214–5, ἦ, καὶ ἀπὸ στήθεσφιν ἐλύσατο κεστὸν ἱμάντα / ποικίλον, ἔνθα τέ οἱ θελκτήρια πάντα τέτυκτο (“she spoke and loosened the colorful *cestus*, which contained all her charms, from her breast”), seem to have inspired Antiphanes 1.1–4 GP *Garland*. The last part of 4, ἐχρήσω δ' εἰς ἐμὲ πᾶσι μόνον (“against me you have used them, every one”), is best taken as indicating that Ino used “them all against me alone” with Gow-Page *ad loc.* This apparently reduces the speaker to a helpless victim, but the reader of the *Iliad* who remembers

the story of Hera and Zeus would know that Zeus, though temporarily subdued, was himself a far from faithful husband (listing his affairs for Hera's benefit in *Il.* 14.315–28) and re-established his power after waking up in *Il.* 15.4. One could then interpret this speech as either an acknowledgement of the speaker's helpless infatuation, or as expressing his Zeus-like recovery of the upper hand.

In Posidippus 19 AB scenes from the *Odyssey* are evoked in a poem about Poseidon causing an earth- and sea-quake, where the phrasing strongly recalls that of Homer.⁴¹ The notion of Poseidon causing disaster is obviously familiar from the *Odyssey* and recalls the story of Odysseus' shipwreck in a general way. More specifically, the episode of Poseidon taking revenge for the blinding of his son Polyphemos is evoked by 6–7. Here the rock hurled by Poseidon is said to be Πολυφημείου σκαιοτέρην θυρεοῦ (“more sinister than Polyphemos' doorstone”) and the use of the noun θυρεοῦ and the qualification οὐκ ἄν μιν Πολύφημος ἐβάστασε (“Polyphemos could not have lifted it”) are reminiscent of *Od.* 9.240–2, ἀντάρ ἔπειτ' ἐπέθηκε θυρεὸν μέγαν ὑψόσ' αἰείρας (sc. Polyphemos), / ὄβριμον· οὐκ ἄν τόν γε δῶ καὶ εἴκοσ' ἄμαξαι / ἐσθλαὶ τετράκυκλοι ἅπ' οὔδεος ὀχλίσσειαν (“Then he lifted a big doorstone and placed it at the entrance; it was huge and not even twentytwo strong four-wheeled waggons could have moved it from the threshold”). In 7–8, σὺν Γαλατείαι / πυκνὰ κολυμβήσας αἰπολικὸς δύσερως (“Galateia's frequent diving companion, a shepherd madly in love”), this Odyssean Polyphemos is blended with the unhappy lover, who is well-known from Hellenistic poems like Theocritus' eleventh *Idyll* and Callimachus 3.1–2 GP. In contrast with Theoc. 11.54–62, however, where he cannot swim, he is here diving in the sea with Galatea, as a true son of Poseidon. Posidippus' poem looks like an attempt to reconcile the “modern” with the “epic” Polyphemos.

8. Conclusion

We have seen that the epic tradition of Homer found its way into the genre of epigram in various ways, generally reduced to brief scenes on the assumption that the reader would be able to supply the information that was left out. In the epigrams on the tombs of epic heroes and the

⁴¹ For details see Bastianini and Gallazzi (2001: 130–2). See further on this poem Petrain (2003); Hunter (2004b: 100–4).

epigrams which contain brief narratives or speeches there is a focus on certain heroes like Ajax, Palamedes and Protesilaus, who played a more or less small role in Homer, but received a great deal of attention in the post-Homeric literary tradition, particularly in tragedy and in Hellenistic and later poetry. In the ecphrastic epigrams the poets also tend to focus on minor heroes, but often seem to relate more to visual art and less to Homer and the literary tradition. Epigrams on the ruins of Troy and Mycene may become part of another kind of discourse: the flames of Troy represent the fire of love, Troy survives its destruction by living on as the origin of Rome and in the poetry of Homer, and, more generally, the distance between past and present is thematized by referring to the once prosperous cities which are now in ruins. In the last group of epigrams the poets show a creative use of epic patterns to raise scenes of mourning and love to an epic level and to “modernize” an epic character like Polyphemus.

This brief investigation sheds light on the development of the genre of epigram and the awareness of the poets of its generic possibilities. The way in which the epigrams deal with the epic themes is a clear sign of the vitality of the Homeric tradition and the Greek cultural heritage related to it. There are not always direct links to the Homeric epics, but rather to other works of literature and visual art which in one way or another were part of the mythological tradition which began with Homer. Yet it is clear that epigram, though fundamentally different as a genre, managed to incorporate itself into that tradition, and vice versa, and profit from it. The ancient authors of epigrams were able to keep the tradition flexible and alive, using it creatively in their own context.⁴²

⁴² I wish to thank Annemarie Ambühl and the members of the *Historische Kring* at Groningen, particularly Helen Wilcox, for their critical reading and stimulating remarks.

INSCRIBING LYRIC¹

Benjamin Acosta-Hughes and Silvia Barbantani

1. *Epigrams on the lyric poets of the “Alexandrian” canon*

Alexandrian scholars of the second and first centuries B.C. decisively influenced the reception of ancient authors considered classics—the best in their genres, worthy models for future generations.² Later sources ascribe to Aristophanes of Byzantium and especially to Aristarchus, as editors and critics of poetry *par excellence*, the authority to inscribe poets in selected lists (Hor. *ars* 450; Quint. 1.4.3, 10.1.54 and 61). By the second and first centuries B.C. nine Greek authors in particular were valued as the superlative representatives of poetry in lyric meters.

The canon of lyric poets was, as far as we know, the only one treated in epigram, appearing in two poems of *GA*, *AP* 9.184 and 571 (= Anon. 36a and b *FGE*), and in an elegy. The first of these may be our earliest evidence for the existence of the Lyric Canon (from the third or second century B.C.). Its author, seemingly from a scholastic-rhetorical environment where epigrams may have been used to memorize data,³ incorporates a short stylistic comment on every poet, praising the Nine as those who raised their genre to perfection:

Pindar, sacred mouth of the Muses, and you, loquacious Siren, / Bacchylides; Aeolic graces of Sappho, / and writings of Anacreon, and you, the one who drew from the Homeric flow, / Stesichorus, in your own poetic efforts, / and the sweet page of Simonides, and you, Ibycus, / who picked the flower of boys and of Persuasion, / and the sword of Alcaeus, which often with the blood of tyrants / made libations,

¹ Silvia Barbantani is the author of “Epigrams on the lyric poets of the ‘Alexandrian’ canon,” Benjamin Acosta-Hughes of “The inscribed voice: lyric in epigram.”

² Radermacher *RE* 10 s.v. Κανών 1873–8; Regenbogen *RE* 20.2 s.v. Πίναξ 1455–61; Pfeiffer (1968: esp. 203–7 on canons), Gallo (1974: 106–9) and Montanari (1994). Sources: Färber (1936: 1.25–6, 2.7–11). A recently published, anonymous epigram of 60 lines, inscribed on stone and found at the site of ancient Halicarnassus (*SGO* 01/12/02), lists a sort of canon of “local glories,” poets and prose writers from this city, never included in the Alexandrian or Pergamene canons. See Isager and Pedersen (2004).

³ Rossi (2002).

protecting the sacred laws of the fatherland, / and Alcman's feminine nightingales; be propitious (ἵλατε), / you, who stood as beginning and end of all lyric poetry.

The final ἵλατε is a religious term, like those used in epigram often of books and poets, sometimes ironically.⁴ Pindar, *lyricorum longe princeps* (Hor. *car.* 4.2; Petron. 2; Quint. 10.1.61) and therefore named first, is "sacred," and portrayed as such in epigrams on him specifically. Ranked second, Bacchylides was allegedly the object of Pindar's invectives.⁵ To this "loquacious Siren" alone no epigrams are dedicated, although he was read and admired at least until the second century A.D.: this may be due to unfavorable comparison with Pindar (ps.Long. 33.5) or the absence of a solid biographical tradition that epigrams might appropriate. Stesichorus' "Homeric" character, the sweetness of Simonides and Alcman, and the grace and the passions of Sappho and Ibycus⁶ are all focal elements in the epigrammatic and rhetorical tradition. Alcaeus as a fervent patriot and a role-model for politicians and "engaged" poets is also traditional.⁷

In the second Canon, Anon. 36b *FGE*, the Nine are arrayed so as to prepare a final *pointe* in honor of one of them—Sappho, the "Tenth Muse" (cp. *AP* 9.58, on the Seven Wonders, which singles out the temple of Ephesus).

The last canon-epigram, a long list in elegiac couplets included in a group of manuscripts of Pindar's *Epimikia* (EPQ),⁸ gives the nine lyric poets as the "first" of their genre, and is clearly addressed to a scholastic environment: it invites the reader to memorize (2: μάνθανε) useful information such as the poets' names, homelands, patronymics, and dialect, derived from reference works (e.g., Didymus' *On the Lyric Poets*) which draw on Peripatetic and Alexandrian sources.⁹ The order of the poets follows only metrical criteria. Although the elegy is copied on Pindar manuscripts, Alcaeus is remarkably ranked first (3–4);

⁴ Cf. *AP* 7.407; 7.27; 7.41; 7.2b; 9.192.7; 11.400; *API* 295–6 and 301.

⁵ Σ Pind. *Ol.* 2.154b, 157a; Σ *Pyth.* 2.97, 131, 166, 171a.

⁶ Σ Pind. *Isth.* 2.1; Cic. *Tusc.* 4.71.

⁷ Hor. *car.* 2.13.26–8; 4.9.7–8; 1.32.3–12; Quint. 5.1.63; Dion. Hal. *de imit.* 421; cf. Athen. 14.627a.

⁸ See Drachmann (1903: 10–1); Labarbe (1968a); Gallo (1974: 93–103); Barbantani (1993: 10–1). Dübner published it in an *appendix* to the *GA* (*Anth. Graec.* III, *caput* III 299, nr. 73). On the manuscripts where the list is copied see Irigoin (1952: 1–11; 131–2).

⁹ On biographical tradition see Arrighetti (1987: 139–228) and (1994); Lefkowitz (1981).

perhaps this was originally conceived rather to accompany an edition of the Lesbian poet.¹⁰

Epigrams on individual authors

No single epigrammatist conceived a complete series of epigrams on the nine lyric poets in the manner of those on the Seven Sages (celebrated separately by Lobon in elegiac couplets, cf. Antipater of Sidon 34 GP (=AP 7.81)).¹¹ Most epigrams on lyric poets were composed between the third century B.C. and the first century A.D., when editions of their poems circulated widely: sometimes they are explicitly referred to as written texts. Two epigrammatists in particular belong to a period when the first editions and commentaries on the works of lyric poets were produced in Alexandria: Leonidas, with four epigrams (on Alcmæon, Pindar, and two on Anacreon) and Dioscorides, with two (on Sappho and Anacreon). The two Antipaters,¹² both living in Rome, and possibly teaching there between the second and first centuries B.C., write the most frequently in praise of the lyric poets. The epigram on poets remained a fashionable genre, although this favor was dictated by a desire to imitate—and rival—previous epigrams rather than to celebrate the ancient poets, as shown by serial variation, especially on Anacreon. The number of epigrams dedicated to an individual poet then is not necessarily evidence for his or her fame and value (only three epigrams celebrate Pindar, one of the most studied poets). Nor need an individual epigrammatist have written about lyric poets he particularly liked: Callimachus, as far as we know, did not compose epigrams

¹⁰ He is said to be the “first” and “more venerable” (γεραρότερος)—with a curious comparative, presuming a comparison between two homonyms. The verse may be corrupted and conceal the name of Alcaeus’ father; Labarbe proposed the reading: Ἀλκαῖος πατέρος Κήκιος Αἰολίδης.

¹¹ The same can be said for other canons: Alcaeus of Messene produced a couple of epigrams on epic poets, 9, 22, and 12 GP (= AP 7.1, 5, and 55), Diodorus wrote on two comic authors, 12 and 15 GP *Garland* (= AP 7.38, 7.370), Dioscorides on some dramatic poets, 20–24 GP (= AP 7.410, 7.708, 7.411, 7.707, and 7.37); Theocritus only on two iambographers, 14 and 13 GP (= AP 7.664: Archilochus, 13.3: Hipponax). On Lobon see Gabathuler (1937: 23–4), Garulli (2004).

¹² Antipater of Sidon 18, 14–17, 12 and 11 GP (= AP 7.34: Pindar; 7.26–7, 29–30: Anacreon; 9.66 and 7.14: Sappho) and Antipater of Thessalonica 74–6, 12 and 19 GP *Garland* (= AP 7.75: Stesichorus; 7.18: Alcmæon; 7.305: Pindar; 7.15 and 9.26: Sappho).

on Pindar; Theocritus often drew from Sappho and Stesichorus, but among his epigrams there is just one, and it portrays Anacreon. The *alea* of transmission and selection can also explain why between the first and sixth centuries A.D. there are no epigrams on the lyric poets in the *GA* (except the *Anacreontea*), although the second century marked a lively revival of interest for archaic lyric poetry.

None of the epigrammatists envisaged a coherent literary program in presenting the ancient lyric poets. Diachronic series of epigrams on the same poet were created over time, and the extant disposition of poems in the *GA* still preserves many of these series. In four cases a reworking of earlier models is plausible or evident, each with a recurrent main theme: Sappho as poetess-Muse; Anacreon as hedonistic reveller; Pindar as poet especially loved by the gods; Alcman's uncertain origin. Sometimes one epigram's dependence on another is obvious, e.g., in the series on Pindar (*AP* 7.34–5, *AP* 305, *AP* 2.382–8) and Anacreon (*AP* 306, 307, 309); in other cases it is harder to recognize the sources: e.g., the *topos* of the Tenth Muse, applied to Sappho with variants, could derive from the early *AP* 9.506, but also from representations of Sappho on Attic vases.

Typical elements in epigrams on lyric poets

There is no one, standard typology for epigrams on the lyric poets: they range from the epitaph to *apophthegmata*, *Buchepigramme* (real or fictitious book “prefaces”) and *ekphraseis* (“descriptions”) of works of art, real or fictitious. Epigrams on an individual poet can belong to different typologies while varying the same motif. In addition, *topoi* generally attested are found also in epigrams on lyric poets, such as:

- a) contrast between the majesty of the author and his/her death, or the misery of the tomb. See, e.g., *AP* 7.35.1–2 (Pindar); *AP* 7.14.1–2, 7.16 (Sappho); *AP* 25.1–2 (Anacreon); *AP* 7.19, 7.18.1–2 (Alcman).
- b) contrast between the poet's homeland and place of burial. See, e.g., *AP* 7.75 (Stesichorus).
- c) reflection of the poet's glory on his/her homeland. See, e.g., *AP* 7.19.3 (Alcman); *AP* 7.27.1 (Anacreon); *AP* 7.718.1–2 and 7.14 (Sappho); *AP* 7.714 (Ibycus).
- d) celebration of poetry's immortality, sometimes explicitly attributed to written means of transmission: books and columns of writing are mentioned. See, e.g., Posidippus 122.5–6 AB (= Athen. 13.596c =

- 18 GP), *AP* 7.14.8, 17, 9.521 (Sappho); *AP* 7.25.1–2, 26.2, 9.239.4 (Anacreon).¹³
- e) preference expressed by the Muses for a poet, with the variant of identifying the poetess with a Muse. See, e.g., *AP* 7.35.1 (Pindar); *AP* 9.506, 7.407, 7.17.5, 9.26.1 (Sappho); *AP* 7.709.5–6, 7.31 (Anacreon); *AP* 7.18.3–4 (Alcman). Occasionally a relationship with other gods is mentioned. See, e.g., *AP* 305 (Pindar and Pan); *AP* 2.383 (Pindar and Apollo), *AP* 2.127 (Stesichorus and Apollo); *AP* 7.745.8 (Ibycus and the Erinyes).
- f) celebration of poetic χάρις or “grace,” especially, but not only, in the case of love poets. See, e.g., *AP* 7.718.2 (Sappho); *AP* 7.25.3 (Anacreon); *AP* 7.19.1 (Alcman).

Lyric poets appear in epigrams in a highly positive light, sometimes almost hagiographically. This happens in the case of Pindar, who always presents himself as specially involved with the divine world, but also in the case of Sappho, whom later authors often faulted for her special devotion to Aphrodite, both pagan (Attic Comedy, Didymus *apud* Sen. *Ep.* 88) and Christian (Tatian). However, the epigrammatists always describe Anacreon sympathetically as the embodiment of the *carpe diem* ideal, in keeping with his type-casting, since the third century B.C., as an old hedonistic reveller. Praise, however, does not always coincide with the biographical tradition, which also included negative judgements:¹⁴ encomiastic poets like Pindar and Simonides were considered greedy; the “erotic” poets, Ibycus, Anacreon, Alcaeus, Sappho, were often faulted for excessive passion. An outstanding exception among epigrams are those dedicated to the iambographers, a genre characterized by a strong *vis polemica* (see *AP* 7.69–71, 351, 405 and 408).¹⁵

Because of their poems’ evidently more personal feeling, monodic authors appear more often: Sappho and Anacreon have eleven and sixteen epigrams respectively—and appear more as human beings than

¹³ Cf. also *AP* 9.507 (Aratus); *AP* 9.575 and 11.347.5 (Homer); *AP* 9.186.1 (Aristophanes); *AP* 7.21.6 (Sophocles); *AP* 9.98 and 9.513.2 (Menander); *AP* 9.545 (Callimachus); *AP* 7.51 (Euripides survives in theatrical shows).

¹⁴ Such judgements occur in fifth-century comedy and later in the Aristotelian school: see Huxley (1974), Richardson (1994).

¹⁵ The meaning of the literary dispute between fans of *vinosus* Archilochus and supporters of Hipponax is not completely clear. See Degani (1984: 173–86, esp. 178–81) on Hipponax’ epitaphs: Theocritus 12 GP (= *AP* 13.3; cf. 14 GP = *AP* 7.664 for Archilochus); Leonidas 58 GP (= *AP* 7.408); Alcaeus of Messene 13 GP (= *AP* 7.536). See also Rossi (2001: 295–303, 323–30), Irwin (1998).

as abstract symbols of poetry. Sappho's type remained unchanged in literary and figurative iconography from the fifth century B.C. to the fifth A.D. (Sappho among the Muses), while Anacreon's portrayal changed radically. The classical and early Hellenistic Anacreon still represents a moderate, aristocratic hedonism, while later poems caricature him. Epigrams do not, however, repeat curious or malicious anecdotes (e.g., Sappho's jump from the rock of Leukas or Anacreon choked by a grape, like Sophocles in *AP* 7.20). The rare anecdotal detail is generally uplifting (e.g., *AP* 7.745: Ibycus' death avenged by divine intervention). Sometimes the educational environment where the texts circulated occasions the positive representation. While third and second century B.C. epigrammatists are mainly court-affiliated scholars, between the first century B.C. and the first A.D. they are generally teachers, rhetors and improvisers (the two Antipaters, Pinytos, Tullius Laurea), reading lyric for practical professional interests.

Historical development of epigram on lyric poets

Literary epigram was first conceived as a short motto (*apophthegma*), or fictitious epitaph reduced to a single couplet, like Lobon's epigrams and the couplets belonging to the *Peplos*.¹⁶ The most elementary formula for sepulchral inscriptions (τύμβος ἔχει + name of the deceased, and occasionally family, homeland, profession) gradually expanded until the fictitious epitaph became a "box" for anecdotes, wishes,¹⁷ and literary comments. Very few epigrams can be proven to have a real link with a statue or a tomb (e.g., *AP* 7.15 for the statue of Sappho in Pergamum). In the Hellenistic period epigrams in the form of *Buchepigramme* (often structured like epitaphs) and *ekphraseis*¹⁸ become a vehicle for literary

¹⁶ For an overview of epigrams on poets see Gabathuler (1937: esp. 107–12); Barbantani (1993) on lyric poets; Rossi (2001: 81–102). *Apophthegmata* were still popular in the second and first centuries B.C. Witness, e.g., Antipater of Thessalonica 73 GP *Garland* and Pinytus 1 GP *Garland* (= *AP* 7.15–6), both on Sappho; Anon. 35(a) *FGE* (= *AP* 7.28), on Anacreon; and even fifth-century A.D. *AP* 7.32–3 on Anacreon.

¹⁷ Epigrams expressing wishes: *AP* 7.23–4, 27 (Anacreon); cf. *AP* 7.22, 36 (Sophocles); *AP* 7.315 (Timon). Epigrams on anecdotes of the poet's death: *AP* 7.20, 745 (Ibycus); cf. *AP* 7.428, 17, 44 and Callimachus fr. 396 Pf. (on Menander).

¹⁸ The descriptions of Anacreon at *AP* 306–9 and the Theocritean 15–7 GP (= *AP* 9.598–600) are probably fictitious. *AP* 310 on Sappho seems to be inspired by a real piece of artwork. On the relationship between statues and epigrams see Rossi

criticism. However, between the second and the first century, a short poem could be used as a kind of *accessus ad auctorem*. At the same time, epigram became a facile medium for showing off among the cultured well-to-do, like Lutatius Catulus' group in Rome; this is the world of Antipater of Sidon, with his variations on Anacreon and Sappho as fixed types, the reveller and the Muse. Sapphic poems became fashionable among *doctae matronae*; in *AP* 11.78.4 Lucilius recalls the circulation of γράμματα τῶν λυρικῶν Λύδια καὶ Φρύγια.¹⁹

The following discussion considers three of the most popular among the lyric poets: Pindar, Sappho and Anacreon.²⁰

Pindar

Only four epigrams celebrate Pindar in *G4*. Eustathius includes an anonymous ancient epigram on the poet's burial in the prologue to his Πινδαρικά παρέκβολα (*vita Eust.* 123–6 Westermann); he also quotes *AP* 305 (= Antipater of Thessalonica 75 *GP Garland*), again as παλαιόν.²¹ Epigrams neither praise Pindar as author of the *Epinikia*, nor discuss the contents of his odes. They consider him mainly as a servant of the Muses and recipient of divine prodigies (Antipater of Thessalonica 75 *GP Garland*), a picture coherent with the biographic tradition—Pindar became, like Homer, a generic symbol of committed poetry. While comedy started to taint the character of Anacreon and Sappho, Pindar—apart from *Ar. Aves* 919–45—remained a venerable figure both in the arts and in the literary tradition.

As in the fifth-century tradition, Leonidas 99 *GP* (= *AP* 7.35) presents the poet as an ideal citizen, a moral authority (*Ar. Nub.* 966–8) loved by gods, everyone's friend, a “worthy man,” ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός:²²

This man was friendly to foreigners, and dear to his fellow-citizens,/
Pindar, minister of beautiful-voiced Pierides.²³

(2001: 91, 102–6); on the portraits of poets see Schefold (1943: 14–47) and (1965); Zanker (1995).

¹⁹ Cassio (1975: 141–2).

²⁰ For Alcmæon, Ibycus, Simonides and Stesichorus see Barbantani (1993: 66–88).

²¹ Westermann (1845: 92, col. 63–8); Christ (1896: 321).

²² Cf. Hes. *Op.* 225; Theogn. 794–5; Pind. *Isthm.* 1.64–5; *Ol.* 13.2–3 and 54; *Nem.* 4.79 and 8.63–71.

²³ Gabathuler (1937: nr. 3). See Barbantani (1993: 15–8) for a commentary.

The couplet follows the elementary structure of an early epitaph (Plut. *mor.* 1030a.7 labels it an “epikedeion”);²⁴ the deictic “this” in the first line may even refer to a statue of the poet (Paus. 1.8.4.9).²⁵

In Egypt the link between Pindar and Ammon was established by the time of Alexander.²⁶ Recalling the propagandistic gesture of the Macedonian king saving the poet’s house in Thebes, the Ptolemies preserved his poetry and collected the biographical material digested in the fourth and third century (Chamaeleon, *Histros*).²⁷ After the establishment of the Canon, where Pindar was ranked *princeps*,²⁸ his praise became more hyperbolic, as in the following poem, Antipater of Sidon 18 GP (= *AP* 7.3), a fictitious epitaph (cf. 9 GP = *AP* 7.6):

Περικὰν σάλπιγγα, τὸν εὐαγέων βαρὺν ὕμνων
χαλκευτάν, κατέχει Πίνδαρον ἄδε κόνις,
οὗ μέλος εἰσαΐων φθέγγαιό κεν ὥς ἀπὸ Μουσῶν
ἐν Κάδμου θαλάμοις σμήνηος ἀπεπλάσατο

The trumpet of the Pierides, heavy blacksmith of pure hymns, / Pindar, is covered by this dust; / hearing his song you could declare that from the Muses / (present) at Cadmos’ wedding the swarm took the model (to mould its honey).

The metaphors of both “trumpet” (i.e., “herald” of the Muses) and “blacksmith” define Pindar’s poetic qualities²⁹ in contrast with sweet-

²⁴ Cf. some of Leonidas’ epigrams on poets, e.g. 30 GP (= *AP* 9.24). The nearest example to this couplet among real inscriptions is an epitaph from Heraclea Pontica dated to the third or second century B.C., *GV* 905; Gow-Page (1965: 2.395); Lattimore (1942: 98, 285–286). Cf. Kaibel (1880: 456); *CEG* 112 (sixth century B.C.); *CEG* 483 (fourth century B.C.). Literary examples (third century B.C.): Leonidas 11 GP (= *AP* 7.440.9–10), imitated by Kaibel 251 and 228 b (cf. Kaibel (1880: 445–6)); *SH* 525; Theocritus 18.1 GP (= *AP* 9.435.1). The epigrammatist could have been inspired by the favorable tradition about Pindar preserved by the Macedonian court, where he lived (Instinsky (1961)).

²⁵ Schefold (1943: 138); Richter (1965: 1.144). The epigram is also attributed, by a lemmatist, to Plato. For Pindar’s fortune in Athens see Wilamowitz (1922: 88–91); Irigoin (1952: 11–20); Gelzer (1972); Pfeiffer (1968: 34–5); Lefkowitz (1981: 49–60). Pindar’s heroic status: Lefkowitz (1975); (1978); (1980); (1981: 57–66).

²⁶ Paus. 9.16.1. The statue of Pindar in the Serapaeum of Memphis is a stone version of the epigrams praising him: the poet is depicted as inspired, eyes turned to the sky, while the Athenian statue realistically portrayed him as a choir instructor. See Picard (1952); Lauer and Picard (1955).

²⁷ Later Alexandrian scholars, like Aristodemus (Athen. 11.495; *Σ Pyth.* 3.137), also explored local traditions on Pindar in mainland Greece.

²⁸ Pindar remained also a key author in high education: Stat. *silv.* 5.3.152–8; Dion. Hal. *de comp.* 22; Quint. 10.1.61; ps.Long. 33.5; Hermog. *π.ιδ.* 1.249 Rabe.

²⁹ “Trumpet” always indicates the excellence of an author above others, as in *AP* 305 on Pindar and *AP* 2.23 on Demosthenes, both the firsts in their canons. For χαλκευτάς, cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 1.86 and 3.113.

ness (3–4). βαρύς “heavy” or “persistent” has a positive connotation (cp. Pind. *Isthm.* 4.51): the poet is an unweakening artisan, forging long-lasting poems (cf. ἀκάματος in Hes. *Theog.* 39).

Though the second couplet is troublesome,³⁰ it clearly refers to the famous anecdote about the infant Pindar fed by bees.³¹ Nurture by bees, a common folk-tale motif in biographies of ancient poets (and also prose writers), symbolizes fluent and smooth elocution.³² The reference to Cadmus, inspired by *Pyth.* 3.89–91, evokes the most perfect song ever sung by the Muses, Cadmus’ wedding-song, affirming Pindar’s almost mythical superiority over all other poets.

Antipater of Thessalonica 75 GP *Garland* (= *API* 305)³³ amplifies and varies Antipater of Sidon 18 GP, conflating two legendary episodes, Pindar’s meeting with Pan, “horned god of mount Maenalos” (5),³⁴ and nurture by bees. The first couplet, “As much as the trumpet overshadows bone flutes,/so much above all the other lyres resounds your lyre,” contaminates the Περιικὸν σάλπιγγα of the previous epigram with a proverbial expression known by Lucian *prec. rhet.* 13; *de domo* 16; *musc. enc.* 2 (“the trumpet has a more powerful sound than the flutes”) to establish Pindar’s superiority above other poets.

Eustathius introduces a fourth epigram (*vita Eust.* 123–6 Westermann) as ancient evidence for Pindar’s daughters, Protomache and Eumetis.³⁵ The two girls are said to have brought back the urn with their father’s

³⁰ For textual problems see Gow-Page (1968: 2.48); Kaibel (1877: 335); Stadtmüller (1900: 149); Gabathuler (1937: 39, nr. 88); Barbantani (1993: 18–21).

³¹ On the sources of the anecdote see Barbantani (1993: 22–3). On the symbolism of honey and bees see Usener (1902: 176–83); *RE* 3 s.v. *Biene* 447–50. Honey is a divine food providing superior knowledge (Pind. *Ol.* 6.45; *Pyth.* 9.63). Pindar compared himself with a bee (*Pyth.* 10.53–4). For the common wordplay between μέλος and μέλι see Färber (1936: 14–5).

³² Hesiod: *vita Lucani* 20–4 Endt; Plato: *Cic. de div.* 1.78, 2.66; Val. Max. 1.6.4; Plin. *N.H.* 11.55; Sophocles: Philostr. *Imag.* 14.1; Ambrose: *vita Paul.* 3.

³³ See Argentieri (2003: 166–7). If the author is Antipater of Thessalonica, it is worth recalling that he was contemporary with Horace, one of the Roman authors more interested in Pindar: he celebrated him as *princeps lyricorum*, a swan flying above all (Hor. *car.* 4.2.25).

³⁴ This epigram is the most ancient source directly linking Pan—whose cult was officially accepted in Athens after 490 (Hdt. 6.105; *API* 232–3; 259)—with Pindar; cf. Plut. *mor.* 1103b; Philostr. *Imag.* 2.12.2; Eust. *vita Pind.* 157–9 Westermann; see Lehnus (1979: 60–1, 93–7).

³⁵ It is also quoted in the *vita Ambrosiana*, von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1922: 444–5) considered the poem very late, while Rose (1931) attributed it to an early Hellenistic *grammaticus*. Lobel had hypothesized that the two women could rather be κόραι, members of a choir, addressed by the poet in his odes (cf. comm. to P.Oxy. 2438, l.25, 31; Arrighetti (1967: 135–43); Lehnus (1979: 9–11); Barbantani (1993: 25–6)).

ashes from Argos. This is the only source locating Pindar's death here; the poet is reduced to λείψανον ("remains"). A picture illustrating the poet's last journey may have occasioned the epigram.³⁶

Sappho

Fifth-century Athens played an important role in creating Sappho's image as later reprised in epigram. In Solon's time (Ael. *apud* Stob. 3.638–9 Hense) her odes were sung in aristocratic symposia and considered a model for love poetry; a few decades later, vase painting portrayed her as a beautiful lady.³⁷ Comedy however exploited her as grotesque and ridiculous,³⁸ with anecdotes like her unhappy love for Phaon. This may well be the origin for the "small and dark" Sappho known from later sources.³⁹ As an erotic poetess, Sappho risked being portrayed as a "feminine Anacreon,"⁴⁰ but epigrammatists always avoided biographical details, locating her love instead within a sacred sphere: Sappho is celebrated as the best poet of her gender (Galen *Protr.* 2).

While in Anon. 36a2 *FGE* Sappho receives generic praise for her "grace," a feature common to all love poets,⁴¹ in the second canon-epigram, Anon. 36b *FGE*, she is the Tenth Muse, a *topos* appearing in the most ancient epigram on Sappho, *AP* 9.506 (= Plato 13 *FGE*).⁴² In addition, from an early date Erinna is compared to Sappho, as in *AP* 9.190.7–8 (= Anon. 38 *FGE*):⁴³

³⁶ On paintings of episodes from Pindar's life, see Paus. 9.22.3 and Philostr. *Imag.* 2.12.

³⁷ Edmonds (1922); Schefold (1943: 54–6); Picard (1948); Richter (1965: 1.70–2).

³⁸ See Amips. 15, Amphis 32, Antiph. 194–5, Ephipp. 20, Timocles 32, Diphil. 70–1 K.-A.

³⁹ Luc. *Imag.* 18; Ov. *Her.* 15.32–6.

⁴⁰ Cf. Didym. *apud* Sen. *Ep.* 88.37; Tatian. *ad Graec.* 33 In the fourth century Themistius condemned her for praising her lovers, like Anacreon (*or.* 13; *Erotikos* 170 d, p. 245 Schenkl).

⁴¹ Cf. Nossis 11.2 GP; Dion.Hal. *Dem.* 40.11; Dem. *de eloc.* 132; Plut. *mor.* 397a; Him. 18.129 Col.

⁴² Gabathuler (1937: nr. 2); Barbantani (1993: 28–30); according to von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1913: 40–1) the couplet could be a comment to a vase painting similar to that, now lost, depicting Sappho between Tamyris and Apollo. Plato *Phaedr.* 235c shows his admiration for "beautiful" Sappho (cf. Athen. 10.424; 13.596; Max.Tyr. 24.7; Plut. *Amat.* 18; Iulian. *Ep.* 30) quoting her near the "wise" Anacreon as an expert in eros. See Rudiger (1933: 7); Mariotti (1967: 1071–2); Del Re (1931: 533–4).

⁴³ Neri (2003: 134, 194–7). The lemma of the *GA*, possibly by influence of the

This Lesbian honeycomb is Erinna's, ... / As much as Sappho is superior to Erinna in lyric poetry, / so much is Erinna superior to Sappho in hexameter poetry.

Frequent allusions to her verse in Alexandrian poetry, especially in Callimachus and Theocritus, attest Sappho's established fame.⁴⁴ Posidippus 122 AB (= Athen. 13.62.596c) subtly celebrates the edition of Sappho's poems, now in the process of being produced in the Alexandrian Library,⁴⁵ through the lover of Sappho's brother Charaxus, the courtesan Doricha, Sappho's only historical link with Egypt. His epigram contrasts the poetess' mortality and her works' immortality: if the beautiful courtesan is remembered in Naucratis for her monument, "the lucid columns (σελίδες) of Sappho's dear song are here and will remain" (5–6), thus fulfilling the poetess' ambition of immortality (fr. 55 V.). A few decades later, Dioscorides 18 GP (= AP 7.407)⁴⁶ is entirely dedicated to Sappho:

ἥδιστον φιλέουσι νέοις προσανάκλιμ' ἐρώτων,
 Σαπφώ, σὺν Μούσαις, ἥ ρά σε Πιερίη
 ἥ Ἑλικῶν εὐκισσος ἴσα πνεΐουσαν ἐκείναις
 κοσμεῖ τὴν Ἑρέσφ Μοῦσαν ἐν Αἰολίδι,
 ἥ καὶ Ὑμὴν Ὑμέναιος ἔχων εὐφρογέα πεύκην
 σὺν σοὶ νυμφιδίων ἴσταθ' ὑπὲρ θαλάμων,
 ἥ Κινύρεω νέον ἔρνος ὀδυρομένη Ἀφροδίτῃ
 σύνθρηνος μακάρων ἱερὸν ἄλσος ὀρήης.
 πάντῃ, πότνια, χαῖρε θεοῖς ἴσα· σὰς γὰρ ἀοιδάς
 ἀθανάτας ἔχομεν νῦν ἔτι θυγατέρας.

Sweetest support of the passions for young lovers, / Sappho, together with the Muses,⁴⁷ to whom you are equal in breathing out (poetry), / certainly Pieria or ivy-clad Helicon/ honor you, Muse of Aeolic Eresos; / or else Hymen Hymenaeus with his burning torch / in your company watches over nuptial beds; / or, lamenting together with Aphrodite /

initial word (Λέσβιον), reads: "to Erinna the Lesbian and to her admirable poem." The same happens to Anyte, defined in the lemma to AP 7.492 as "Mytilenaea," and to Nossis (cf. lemma of 11 GP).

⁴⁴ See Costanza (1930: 25–8); Gow (1950: 495, 504); Daly (1975: 401–2); Pretagostini (1977); Segal (1984); Dagnini (1986); Vox (1986); Falivene (1981).

⁴⁵ On Sappho's edition: Nicosia (1974: 32–3, 247–50); Yatromanolakis (2001). On Chamaeleon's monography see Scorza (1934: 12–5); Di Benedetto (1982: 221–4).

⁴⁶ Gabathuler (1937: 25, 79–80; nr. 60); Barbantani (1993: 33–6).

⁴⁷ Cf. AP 7.12.6 (Erinna ἄμμιγα Πιερίσιν); AP 7.22.6 (Sophocles Μουσέων ἄμμιγα); AP 9.63.4 (Lyde "common work of the Muses and Antimachus"). For the *topos* see Tarditi (1989: 34–5).

mourning the young bud of Cinyras, you contemplate the grove sacred to the Blessed. / Hail o Lady, in everything equal to the gods; / in fact still now we have / your songs as your immortal daughters.

Sappho as “Muse of Aeolic Eresus” reflects Dioscorides’ access to biographical material gathered in the Library of Alexandria; he is the only epigrammatist to follow the Peripatetic Phanias of Eresus, author of *On Poets*, who first located Sappho in his own city.⁴⁸ Sappho’s depiction as a person with real feelings commends her to all lovers, men (φιλέουσι νέοις, masculine) and women,⁴⁹ a wider horizon than in the earlier, feminine epigrams about Nossis and Erinna (Anon. 38 *FGE* and Nossis 11 GP = *AP* 7.718). The second part of the epigram locates Sappho in the world of her poems. Her framing within a hieratic sphere (weddings and cult) reveals a first-hand knowledge of the Alexandrine edition. The presentation of Sappho as Hymenaeus’ “companion” refers to her wedding poetry, while Aphrodite’s mourning for Adonis refers to Sappho’s hymns.⁵⁰ The epigram closes like a hymn: the ritual χαῖρε befits a divinized poetess; the real homeland of Sappho is now Helicon; and Sappho’s odes, her “daughters,”⁵¹ are also immortal (cf. *AP* 9.575.6: λήθη γηραλέων ἀρπάσσεται σελίδων, and Posidippus 122.5–6 AB).

Three epigrams on Sappho are attributed to Antipater of Sidon. The longest, *AP* 7.14 (= 11 GP),⁵² is her first fictitious epitaph. Here for the first time Sappho is considered a delight “for all Greece,” not just for her homeland:⁵³ the works of ancient authors preserved and edited in Alexandria are now a common treasure for the entire Greek-speaking world.

The other two epigrams attributed to this Antipater are single couplets: *AP* 9.66 (= 12 GP), another on the motif of the Tenth Muse, and 73 GP, an inscription on the now lost base of a Pergamene statue of

⁴⁸ Literary tradition split Sappho in two opposite characters, cf. Nymph. *apud* Athen. 13.596b; Suidas’ two articles *s.v.* Σαπφώ; Della Corte (1950: 37–48, 68–70).

⁴⁹ Cf. *AP* 7.26.2 (Anacreon vindicates the utility of his poetry). For Sappho’s usefulness for lovers see also Ov. *Ars* 3.329–31; *Rem.* 759–62.

⁵⁰ Sapph. fr. 140 and 168 V; Athen. 2.69b d; Call. fr. 478 Pf.; Theocr. *Id.* 15.100–44; Bion *Epit. Adon.*

⁵¹ For poems as “children” of the poet cf. *AP* 9.192.1–2; *APL* 292.3; Pind. *Nem.* 4.2.

⁵² Gabathuler (1937: nr. 78); Barbantani (1993: 36–7).

⁵³ For panhellenic fame cf. Callimachus 57 GP (= *AP* 9.565); Antipater of Sidon 9 GP (= *AP* 7.6); Demiurgus 1 *FGE* (= *AP* 7.52); “Thucydides” or “Timotheus” *FGE* (= *AP* 7.45); Antipater of Thessalonica 19 GP *Garland* (= *AP* 9.26).

Sappho.⁵⁴ Speaking in the first person, she proudly presents herself as best among poetesses, as Homer is outstanding among male poets, represented in the nearest statue whose base was also found on location, inscribed with three epigrams. In the first century Sappho's fame among epigrammatists is confirmed by allusions to her odes in the poems of Antipater's younger contemporary, Meleager.⁵⁵

Between the first century B.C. and the first A.D. at least three epigrams on Sappho are produced in Rome.

Tullius Laurea composed a fictitious epitaph praising the poetess, *AP* 7.17 (= 1 *GP Garland*). Possibly a *Buchepigramm* accompanying a gift, it refers to a nine-book edition of Sappho's poems, called *Enneas* (5–6).⁵⁶ An epitaph attributed to Pinytus⁵⁷ (*AP* 7.16 = 1 *GP Garland*) and dated to the first century A.D., styles the odes of Sappho, with a Callimachean echo, as σοφαὶ ῥήσιες (cf. *AP* 9.507.3–4).

Antipater of Thessalonica offers an interesting amplification on the *topos* of Sappho as the Tenth Muse in *AP* 9.26 (= 19 *GP Garland*):⁵⁸ Gaia, the Earth, produces a list of nine poetesses, mortal Muses corresponding to the Heavenly Nine (9–10). These divine women are also presented as “artisans of eternal pages” (8: ἀενάων ἐργάτιδας σελίδων), an image recalling Pindar χαλκευτής in Antipater of Sidon 18.2 *GP*. Sappho, not explicitly singled out as the best of the nine, bears the classical epithet “female Homer” (3: θῆλυν Ὅμηρον, summing up Antipater of Sidon 73 *GP*) and “ornament of the Lesbian women” (Λεσβιάδων κόσμον).

AP 9.189 (= Anon. 33 *FGE*) has the look of an *accessus ad auctorem* for a later scholastic edition,⁵⁹ but has also been judged “Alexandrian in style and spirit”.⁶⁰

⁵⁴ *CIG* 2.3555; Gabathuler (1937: nr. 80); Skiadas (1965: 128–30); Richter (1965: 1.70); Webster (1964: 186, 206); Argentieri (2001: 103–4). The base, now lost, has been dated to the last quarter of second century B.C.; on the Pergamum acropolis there were also statues of Alcaeus, Timotheus, and Herodotus (Plin. *NH* 35.9.10).

⁵⁵ Cp. *AP* 4.1.6~Sapph. fr. 55; *AP* 4.1.6.27~fr.105a; *AP* 4.1.6.35~fr.71.5. See Citti (1978).

⁵⁶ On the model of Antipater of Sidon 11 *GP* and “Simonides” *AP* 7.25 (= 67.1–2 *FGE*), on Anacreon. It is still doubtful whether this was the Aristarchan edition; see Yatromanolakis (1999).

⁵⁷ Gow-Page (1968: 2.464–5); Barigazzi (1982: 31–3). The author is identified by Jacobs (*RE* 20.2 s.v. *Pinytos* 1714) as a *grammaticus* and a freedman active in Neronian circle.

⁵⁸ Barbantani (1993: 41–3); Burzacchini (1997); Giangrande (1999).

⁵⁹ See von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1913: 42); Dörrie (1972: 235–42), who ascribed it to Antipater of Thessalonica.

⁶⁰ Page (1981) *ad loc.*

Come to the splendid temple of wide-eyed Hera, / Lesbian women,
slowly striding on your delicate feet (ἄβρὰ ποδῶν βήμαθ' ἐλίσσόμεναι); /
there for the goddess you will form a beautiful choir; / your guide will be
Sappho, holding the golden lyre. / Blessed for the most happy dance! /
Certainly you will think you hear a sweet song from Calliope herself.

The poem may be ecphrastic, describing a ritual dance guided by Sappho holding the symbol of her poetic primacy, originally the attribute of Apollo Musagetes (cf. Hor. *car.* 2.13.22). Hera as the object of Sappho's priestly devotion may allude to one of Sappho's *Hymns*,⁶¹ and hence to real Lesbian cults, like the beauty contest in the temple of Hera described by Alcaeus fr. 130b.17–8.⁶²

Anacreon

The epigrammatic tradition views Anacreon as a character rather than an author. His work did not survive in its entirety beyond the third century A.D., possibly because Hellenistic and Byzantine *Anacreontea* “killed Anacreon.”⁶³ In epigram, the poet is mostly the aged singer of wine and love.⁶⁴ Although many epigrams attributed to him celebrated the war-dead (Strabo 14.1.30),⁶⁵ his political side was completely effaced among later epigrammatists. A fragment in hexameters by Critias (Athen. 13.600d)⁶⁶ already depicts Anacreon as a love poet, aristocratic symposiarch, and expert in “feminine songs” (γυναικείων μελέων), while in later epigrams he appears mostly as the champion of homosexual eros.

Similarly, two “Simonidean” epigrams, *AP* 7.24 and 25 (= 66–7 *FGE*),⁶⁷ depict Anacreon as an inspired reveller and lover. Such depic-

⁶¹ Still quoted by third-fourth century rhetors: see Mesk (1927); Meerwaldt (1954: 19–38); Gallavotti (1965).

⁶² Cf. Sapph. 16.17 V: ἔρατόν τε βῶμα. Annual Kallisteia are also known to Theophrastus (Athen. 13.610 a), cf. Σ Hom *Il.* 9.129; Hesych. *s.v.* Πυλαϊίδες.

⁶³ Thus von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1913: 110).

⁶⁴ For biographic details see Gentili (1958: x–xiii); Caudelier (1984).

⁶⁵ Eighteen epigrams are included by Meleager (*AP* 4.1.35–6).

⁶⁶ Wilson (2003). In Critias' time, a bronze statue of Anacreon erected by Pericles stood on the Acropolis (Paus. 1.25.1; cf. Richter (1965: tab. 271–90); Zanker (1965: 29–38). Pausanias describes the statue as “a drunk man singing”; it has been identified with the copy in Copenhagen (Schefold (1943: 64); Richter (1965: tab. 278–83; 294–5)), which, however, represents the poet in a dignified, “heroic” way.

⁶⁷ Gabathuler (1937: nrr. 4–5; 44–5); Barbantani (1993: 49–52).

tions degenerate into grotesque imagery in the course of the third and second centuries B.C. In *AP* 306–7 (= Leonidas 31 and 90 GP),⁶⁸ Anacreon is a servant of Bacchus simply because he is drunk. 31 GP completely collapses the author and his poetic *persona*:

πρέσβυν Ἀνακρείοντα χύδαυ σεσαλαγμένον οἴνω
 θάεο δινωτοῦ στρεπτόν ὑπερθε λίθου,
 ὡς ὁ γέρων λίχνοισιν ἐπ' ὄμμασιν ὑγρὰ δεδορκώς
 ἄχρι καὶ ἀστραγάλων ἔλκεται ἀμπεχόναν,
 δισσῶν δ' ἀρβυλίδων τὰν μὲν μίαν οἶα μεθυπλήξ
 ὤλεσεν, ἐν δ' ἐτέρᾳ ῥικνὸν ἄραρε πόδα.
 μέλπει δ' ἡὲ Βάθυλλον ἐφίμερον ἡὲ Μεγιστᾶν
 αἰώρων παλάμα τὰν δυσέρωτα χέλυν.
 ἀλλά, πάτερ Διόνυσε, φύλασσε μιν· οὐ γὰρ ἔοικεν
 ἐκ Βάκχου πίπτειν Βακχιακὸν θέραπα.

Behold the old Anacreon, confused and stumbling from wine, / hunched on the polished stone; / see how the old man, looking languidly with humid eyes, / drags his dress down by the ankles; / of his two sandals, he lost one, because he is drunk; / in the other he still keeps his wrinkled foot. / He sings either his desire for Bathyllus or Megistias, / raising in his hand the lyre of unlucky Loves. / But, o father Dionysus, protect him: it is not fitting / that a servant of Bacchus fall because of Bacchus.

In another third-century epigram, Theocritus *AP* 9.599 (= 15 GP),⁶⁹ a statue of the poet in Teos becomes a pretext for a short sketch of Anacreon's main qualities (6: "his entire personality," ὅλον τὸν ἄνδρα), reduced to a standardized characterization: poetic excellence (4: he is "something terrific among the ancient lyric poets!" τῶν πρόσθ' εἴ τι περισσὸν ᾧδοποιῶν) and passion for young men (5).

An epigram by Dioscorides, *AP* 7.31 (= 19 GP), appears directly inspired by the verses of the lyric poet and not merely by previous epigrams. The epigrammatist imagines that in the afterlife Anacreon, though still remembering Smerdyes and Bathyllus, can at last have Eurypile, the blonde who snubbed him for the *nouveau-riche* Artemon (fr. 8 Gentili)—a rare feminine presence in the epigrams about Anacreon,

⁶⁸ Gabathuler (1937: 75; nos. 34–5). Leonidas 90 GP is a variation in trimeters on his 31 GP. See Webster (1964: 219–21); Rosenmeyer (1992: 24–7); Rossi (2001: 16–27, 279–285).

⁶⁹ It belongs to a series praising ancient poets: Gabathuler (1937: 21, 75–6); Bing (1988a) and Rossi (2001: 279–87). In the second century A.D., Teos minted coins with the image of its fellow citizen, in the act of playing the lyre (Richter (1965: tab. 294–7)): do epigram and the coin refer to the same statue?

later recalled only by Antipater of Sidon (*AP* 7.27 = 15 GP). At line 2 the apostrophe to Anacreon as “lord of the revel and of every nightly feast” (κώμου καὶ πάσης κοίρανε παννυχίδος) may be inspired by Critias’ fragment, line 8 (παννυχίδας θ’ ἱερὰς θήλεις χοροὶ ἀμφιέπωσιν). The wish that a Dionysian vine would flourish on the tomb of the drinker (cf. “Simonides” 66.7–8 *FGE*) is amplified in a suggestive Bacchic scene (5–8):⁷⁰

may fountains of pure wine erupt spontaneously, / and may shots of ambrosial nectar come from the Blessed, / and may the gardens spontaneously produce violets, / flowers which love the evening, and may myrtles / grow with tender dew.

Antipater of Sidon explores multiple variations on the same theme in five epigrams (*AP* 7.23, 26, 27, 29, 30 = 13–7 GP),⁷¹ while his contemporary, Moschus (*Epit. Bion.* 90), celebrates Anacreon among those Greek poets still honored by their own homelands. In the first century Meleager, who often took inspiration from his lyrics,⁷² once again recalls Anacreon as erotic poet (*AP* 4.1.35 (= 1 GP): γλυκὺν . . . μέλισμα / νέκταρος, “sweet song . . . of nectar”). Perhaps appreciated in the group of Lutatius Catulus,⁷³ surely Anacreon was later a model for love poets like Catullus and Propertius. Horace possibly alludes to the epigrams on Anacreon as a reveller (*dicunt*, *Epod.* 14.9–12). His contemporary Philodemus judged Anacreon’s love poems negatively (ps.Plut. *de mus.* 19.14; 14.168),⁷⁴ while Ovid emulated his epigrammatic portrait in *Ars* 3.330, *Rem.* 3.762, and *Trist.* 2.363–4. In the same period Crinagoras wrote his epigram for an edition of Anacreon, as a gift to the noble Antonia, *AP* 9.239 (= 7 GP *Garland*), unique evidence for a five-book edition of Anacreon in Rome—selections or the complete Alexandrian edition? Often considered inauthentic, the crucial lines 3–4 are corrupt:⁷⁵

⁷⁰ Cf. Eur. *Bacch.* 142–9; Plat. *Ion* 534a; Phil. *Imag.* 1.14,30,23.

⁷¹ Gabathuler (1937: nrr. 83–7); Gow (1954); Barigazzi (1982), Chirico (1981); White (1985: 53–86); Barbantani (1993: 55–60); Argentieri (2001: 87, 111).

⁷² E.g., Meleager 53 GP (= *AP* 5.214) ≈ fr. 13 Gentili; 41 GP (= *AP* 5.24) ≈ fr. 46 Gentili.

⁷³ Gell. 10.9.9.4–10 compares the poets of this circle to Sappho and Anacreon as examples of erotic genre.

⁷⁴ Cf. Sen. *Ep.* 88: *libidinosior Anacreon an ebriosior vixit*.

⁷⁵ Gentili (1958: xxviii); Gow-Page (1968: 2.217–8); Barbantani (1993: 61–2).

βύβλων ἡ γλυκερὴ λυρικῶν ἐν τεύχεϊ τῷδε
 πεντὰς ἀμιμήτων ἔργα φέρει χαρίτων.
 †'Ανακρείοντος, ὅς ὁ Τήιος ἡδὺς πρέσβυς
 ἔγραψεν ἢ παρ' οἶνον ἢ σὺν ἡμέροις†

The sweet collection of five lyric books in this casket / contains the inimitable work of the Charites / of Anacreon, which the sweet old man from Teos / wrote over drinking⁷⁶ and in the company of Desires.

The five papyrus rolls are enclosed in a *capsa* (cp. Theocritus *Id.* 16.8–13); and “work of the Charites” (ἔργα... Χαρίτων, 3) recalls the description of the *Lyde* as the “common work of the Muses and Antimachus” (Crinagoras *AP* 7.63.4 = 7 *GP Garland*) and of Sappho’s poems as χαρίτων ἄνθος (Nossis 11.2 *GP*). Consonant with the gift of a manuscript, the poet is represented as writing, though the image of Anacreon full of wine and desires reprises earlier epigrammatic portraits.

2. *The inscribed voice: lyric in epigram*

ὦ ξεῖν', εἰ τύ γε πλεῖς ποτὶ καλλίχορον Μιτυλήναν
 τᾶν Σαπφούς χαρίτων ἄνθος ἐναυσόμενος
 εἰπεῖν ὡς Μούσαισι φίλαν τήνα τε Λόκρισσα
 τίκτεν· ἴσαις δ' ὅτι μοι τοῦνομα Νοσσίς, ἴθι.⁷⁷

Friend, if you sail for Mitylene with its lovely dancing ground / to breathe in the flower of Sappho’s Graces, / tell how a Locrian woman bore one loved by the Muses, / and by her. Know that my name is Nossis. Now go.

(Nossis 11 *GP* = *AP* 7.718)

Nossis here juxtaposes places at once geographically and temporally distinct, two voices of female poets, and two poetic genres, the one, lyric song, made vividly present in the other, “inscribed” epigram.⁷⁸ The juxtapositions invite closer reading. Initially, the poem appears to take the form of a sepulchral epigram, particularly the epitaph of one dead

⁷⁶ In Nicaenetus *AP* 13.29 Cratinus is presented as an inspired old drunkard; παρ' οἶνον recalls Hedylus’ epigram for Socles 6 *GP* 6: παρ' οἶνον... παίζει μελιχρότερον.

⁷⁷ Text of lines 3–4 after Gallavotti (1971: 243, 245–6), followed by Gutzwiller (1998a: 85–6); both prefer the *ms* text.

⁷⁸ Recent bibliography on this poem includes Bowman (1998); Gutzwiller (1998a: 85–6); Skinner (1989), (1991a) and (1991b); Tarán (1979: 146–7). On the “inscription” of this type of epigram see Bing (1998: 29–30).

far from home;⁷⁹ the “reader” of the first line and a half may further imagine something of the context of a *propemptikon*, of which Sappho fr. 5 V. is an early example. Indeed such a journey is the first image that comes to the reader’s mind up to the pentameter caesura; χάριτες on this reading are “Graces,” an unsurprising presence in the language of archaic lyric. Then the epigram evolves. With ἄνθος ἐναυσόμενος it becomes clear that the poem’s intent is differently pointed, that χαρίτων ἄνθος are Sappho’s poems, and that ἐναυσόμενος is applied to a reader, even a future poet seeking to draw inspiration from Sappho’s verses.⁸⁰ The χαρίτων ἄνθος, with its connotation of poetic texts, further contrasts with the occasional song suggested in καλλίχορον;⁸¹ Sappho here is her poetry, both recalled and read.⁸²

With the second distich the reader is drawn back to the present, and the present context of the poem’s occasion. The poem evolves *not* into a celebration of Sappho per se, but rather of Nossis in relation to Sappho. The poem maintains the conventional conceits of sepulchral epigram (the message borne, the name of the deceased one, the bid to depart), but is transformed now into a celebration of another female poet, the singer of the *envoi*, Nossis, of her poetic heritage, and of her poetry. The names of the two poets, Sappho and Nossis, are set off in opposing positions in the pentameters of the two distichs. The epigram’s structure thus effectively configures, on its own generic terms, the lineage Sappho-Nossis.⁸³

This second section of our study focuses on the resonances of three lyric poets, Sappho, Alcaeus and Anacreon, in a variety of Hellenistic epigrams. This necessarily selective reading is nonetheless an arresting

⁷⁹ Cf. e.g., Asclepiades 31 GP (= AP 7.500), Callimachus 43 GP (= 12 Pf. = AP 7.521); see Tarán (1979: 132–49).

⁸⁰ Gutzwiller (1998: 86). Cf. Callim. *Iambus* 13.13–4 and 65–6: οἱ τὰ μέτρα μέλλοντες / τὰ χωλὰ τίττειν μὴ ἀμαθῶς ἐναύονται, also with the sense of drawing inspiration from the poetic “past.” Intriguingly the literary passerby of Nossis’ epigram, in a poem where all other referents are female, is masculine. On the audience of Nossis’ epigrams see Skinner (1989: 41–2), and the reservations of Bowman (1998: 42–3).

⁸¹ See Bowman (1998: 40). καλλίχορον may be even more appropriate here as some of Sappho’s poetry was, as Battezzato (2003: 37–8) observes, conceptualized as performed with dances. Cf. ps.-Dem. *de eloc.* 167.

⁸² Theocr. 16.6 provides a parallel use of χάριτες as texts, while at 16.104 the Charites appear in their role as goddesses—both poems play on the potential ambiguity of the term. See Gutzwiller (1983: 221–3); Bing (1988a: 20–1); Hunter (1996: 98–101); Acosta-Hughes (forthcoming 2007).

⁸³ If Brunk’s text for line 3: φίλαν τήν τε Λοκρίν γὰρ is preferred, there is the parallelism of place names at the end of each hexameter; see Bowman (1998: 41).

one that suggests something of the complex rapport of later literary epigram to lyric song, as well as strategies and traditions of reading. The Hellenistic epigrammatists knew the lyric poets both as subjects of cultural selection and preservation, and also as edited texts. Dioscorides 18 GP is one particularly striking witness to this; the interwoven allusions to the first book of Sappho in lines 8–9 of this poem (ἱερὸν ἄλσος, 8 ≈ Sappho fr. 2.1–2 V. χάριεν μὲν ἄλσος; πότνια, 9 ≈ Sappho fr. 1.4 V. πότνια; θεοῖς ἴσα, 8 ≈ Sappho fr. 31.1 V. ἴσος θεοῖσιν) attest not only the textual association of these poems, but also their enduring popularity. As in other Hellenistic and Roman poetic genres that imitate Sappho, recollections of fr. 1 (as opening poem of the Alexandrian Sappho collection) and 31 V. are particularly frequent in epigram.⁸⁴ The engagement of later epigram authors with lyric texts also occasions the vivid portrayal of Posidippus' Doricha epigram (122 AB), where the lyric voice, and subject matter, of Sappho are recalled to Egypt as “voice-giving” physical texts that are inscribed, in their turn, in epigram.

Although we do not now generally accept the epigrams ascribed to lyric poets as genuine, clearly their place in the Alexandrian literary tradition complicates the reception of their authors, particularly in generic terms. If the Alexandrian reader knew Sappho and Anacreon as, even if not primarily, epigram authors, this alters something of the dynamic of artistic appropriation—the lyric poets have then themselves already effected the generic “crossing” into epigram, and a later epigram tradition evokes, rather than effects, this transference. Although many of these are dated to a later period, it is the credible possibility of epigram authorship by lyric poets that is really at issue.⁸⁵ The inclusion of both poets, Sappho and Anacreon, in Meleager's *Garland* certainly suggests the plausibility of their authorship in the Hellenistic period, even if, in Sappho's case, Meleager underlines that her epigrams in his collection are few.⁸⁶ Of Anacreon Meleager clearly seems to have had a collection of epigrams, arranged alphabetically, to hand. The extant epigrams ascribed to Anacreon are for the most part short (many are one distich) sepulchral and dedicatory poems; a few might

⁸⁴ On first poems see esp. Barchiesi (2000: 171–3).

⁸⁵ The authors thank Peter Bing for helpful commentary on this point.

⁸⁶ Meleager 1.5–6 GP (= *AP* 4.1); Yatromanolakis (1999: 183, 185–6) has suggested that this collection of epigrams was the later known ninth book of Sappho.

be contemporary with Anacreon, some are clearly later compositions.⁸⁷ Again this slightly problematizes the scenario of artistic emulation and imitation, and necessarily raises some questions on how a later generation of poets viewed their objects of imitation.⁸⁸

Sappho

Features of Sappho's extant lyric that echo in Hellenistic epigram include her erotic language, imagery of sensual luxury (ἀβροσύνη) and the depiction of young girlhood. Among the texts that recall Sappho's poem φαίνεται μοι κείνος (fr. 31 V), one of the most revealing, in terms of epigrammatic adaptation of lyric language and imagery, is Meleager 10 GP (= *AP* 5.212), in particular the first four lines:⁸⁹

αἰεὶ μοι δύνει μὲν ἐν οὐασιν ἦχος Ἑρώτος⁹⁰
 ὄμμα δὲ σῖγα Πόθοις τὸ γλυκὺ δάκρυ φέρει·
 οὐδ' ἡ νύξ, οὐ φέγγος ἐκοίμισεν, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ φίλτρων
 ἦδη που κραδίᾳ γνωστὸς ἔνεστι τύπος.
 ὦ παανοί, μὴ καὶ ποτ' ἐφίπτασθαι μὲν, Ἑρώτες,
 οἶδατ', ἀποπτῆναι δ' οὐδ' ὅσον ἰσχύετε;

Ever does Love's sound descend in my ears, / and my silent eye offers a sweet tear to the Desires. / Neither night nor daylight lays me to sleep, but by charms / already in my heart, I think, the familiar stamp is set. / Winged Loves, is it that you know how to fly here, / but have not the strength to fly away?

The epigram's opening distich recalls the vivid sensory images of Sappho's poem, though differently; whereas Sappho's description is of sensory perceptions and reactions (the seeing and hearing of the beloved), Meleager's is descriptive of physiological sensation alone. Aural and visual sensations are in reverse order of the poem's lyric model. The epigram's first four lines parallel something of the move from external to internal in the opening lines of Sappho's poem, but at the caesura of line 4 comes recognition rather than confusion (Sappho

⁸⁷ 123–4 *FGE*; Gutzwiller (1998a: 37–8, 51–3).

⁸⁸ A similar question arises whether Catullus, who widely imitates Sappho, would have known her as an author of epigram as well.

⁸⁹ See Gutzwiller (1998a: 298) on the “Meleagrian” sequence 5.211, 12.166 and 5.212.

⁹⁰ Guidorizzi (1992: 119) suggests Ἑρώτων to parallel Ἑρώτες in the poem's fifth line.

fr. 31 V.: καρδίαν ἐν στήθεσιν ἐπτόαισεν); the fixity of γνωστός ἔνεστι τύπος (which might be taken in a double sense, as meaning both “of Eros” and “of Sappho’s text/experience”) surprises the poem’s reader. Sappho fr. 31 V. finds a number of remarkable imitations in Hellenistic poetry, among them Asclepiades 5 GP (= *AP* 5.210) and Posidippus 129 AB (= *AP* 5. 211), the other poems in the same short Melegrian sequence as 10 GP. It is intriguing that Meleager, himself an emulator of Sappho, collected these epigrams together, and indicates something of the possible use of a poetic model not only for later composition but also for associative reading.⁹¹

Meleager differently re-writes one of the features of Sappho’s erotic poetry that most struck her ancient readers, among them the author of *On the Sublime* who preserves fr. 31 V.:⁹² the experience of contradictory sensations. Line 6 in particular seems to recall Sappho fr. 48 V.: ἦλθες..., ἔγω δέ σ’ ἐμαϊόμαν, / ὃν δ’ ἔψυξας ἔμαν φρένα καιομένην πόθῳ, “you came, I was mad for you, you cooled my heart burning with desire,” yet the epigram overall recalls something both of the discursive style of fr. 31 V. and the resignation at that poem’s broken end (line 17: ἀλλὰ πὰν τόλματον ἐπεὶ †καὶ πένητα†). Meleager 22 GP (= *AP* 12.132):

ἂ ψυχὴ βαρύμοχθε, σὺ δ’ ἄρτι μὲν ἐκ πυρὸς αἴθη,
 ἄρτι δ’ ἀναψύχεις πνεῦμ’ ἀναλεξαμένη,
 τί κλαίεις; τὸν ἄτεγκτον ὅτ’ ἐν κόλποισιν Ἔρωτα
 ἐντρεφες, οὐκ ἦδεις ὡς ἐπὶ σοὶ τρέφετο;
 οὐκ ἦδεις; νῦν γνῶθι καλῶν ἀλλαγμὰ τροφείων,
 πῦρ ἅμα καὶ ψυχρὰν δεξαμένη χιόνα.
 αὐτὴ ταῦθ’ εἴλου· φέρε τὸν πόνον. ἄξια πάσχεις
 ὧν ἔδρας, ὅπῃ καιομένη μέλιτι.

My soul, heavy afflicted, now you burn in fire, / and now you are refreshed,
 catching your breath. / Why do you weep? When you nursed pitiless Love
 on your lap, / didn’t you know that you nursed him to your sorrow? /
 Didn’t you know? Well recognize now the payoff for your cares, / taking
 fire together with cold snow. / You yourself chose this. Bear your labor.
 You suffer rightly / for what you’ve done, burning from boiling honey.

Emulation of Sappho colors erotic epigram from its beginning; the variety of Asclepiades’ allusions to Sappho is remarkable, and an important marker for the evolution of epigram as a more complex art form, one that “reads” a variety of earlier poetry. Parallels with extant

⁹¹ See below on Dioscorides *AP* 5.52–6.

⁹² “Longinus” *de subl.* 10.1–3.

Sappho occur in 2 GP (= *AP* 5.85) and Sappho fr. 114 V. on virginity and its loss, and quite possibly in the invocation of Night as witness to the singer's condition at the opening of 13 GP (= *AP* 5.164).⁹³ Of great interest here is Asclepiades' priamel epigram that may well have stood at the opening of his collected epigrams.⁹⁴ While the proximate model for this poem seems likely to be Anyte 18 GP (= *AP* 228),⁹⁵ Asclepiades appropriates here to his programmatic epigram both Sappho's priamel form and something of her subject presentation; the contrast of opposites is particularly remarkable (thirst/drink, winter/spring), as is the shift in referents. Asclepiades 1 GP (= *AP* 5.169):

ἡδὺ θέρους διψῶντι χιῶν ποτόν, ἡδὺ δὲ ναύταις
 ἐκ χειμῶνος ἰδεῖν εἰαρινὸν Στέφανον·
 ἥδιον δ' ὁπόταν κρύψη μία τοὺς φιλέοντας
 χλαῖνα, καὶ αἰνῆται Κύπρις ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων.

Sweet is snow as a drink for one thirsty, and sweet for sailors / to see
 Spring's crown after a winter's storm. / But sweeter is it when one blanket
 covers two in love, / and Cypris is praised by both.

Nossis in turn echoes this epigram of Asclepiades in her own programmatic opening poem (1 GP = *AP* 5.170); especially effective in Nossis' recollection of Asclepiades is her perception of Asclepiades as reader of Sappho. Both Sappho herself, and a rhetorical form for which she was admired (the priamel), come to enter the erotic epigram tradition.

Dioscorides' admiration for Sappho finds both the explicit venue of an epigram celebrating both poet and her poetry (18 GP) and a series of allusions suggesting the adaptability of Sappho's imagery and its recall to erotic epigram. Whereas Sappho's sexual imagery is to a certain degree implicit, in keeping with lyric decorum,⁹⁶ Dioscorides is far more sexually graphic, and his use of his lyric model(s) in creating this characteristic of his poetry is very revealing. A couple of his epigrams interweave lyric models; the influence of both Archilochus' Cologne epode (196a W) and Sappho fr. 2 V. resonates in the graphically sexual poem 5 GP (= *AP* 5.55);⁹⁷ the configuration of flight, Eros

⁹³ Cf. Sappho fr. 151 V.: ὀφθαλμοῖς δὲ μέλαις νύκτος ἄωρος

⁹⁴ Guichard (2004: 142); Gutzwiller (1998a: 72, 123).

⁹⁵ See Gutzwiller (1998a: 72, 74).

⁹⁶ Winkler (1996: 102, 106).

⁹⁷ Cf. Dioscorides 5.2 GP: ἄνθεσιν ἐν ≈ Archil. fr. 196a.42 W: ἐν ἄνθε[σιν]; Dioscorides 5.7 GP: λευκὸν μένος ≈ Archil. fr. 196a.52 W: λευκ[ὸν] μένος. Recalling the erotic setting of Sappho fr. 2 V., Dioscorides has transferred the elements of the

and the hunt of 8 GP (= *AP* 12.169) recalls both Sappho fr. 1 V. and Anacreon (e.g., fr. 4 and 55 *PMG*).⁹⁸ Dioscorides 1.1 GP (= *AP* 5.56): ἐκμαίνει χεῖλῃ με ῥοδόχροα, ποικιλόμυθα, is a striking example of his *variatio in imitatione*. Five of Dioscorides' poems (6, 3, 7, 5, 1 GP) form a small group in the fifth book of the *AP*; these, not coincidentally, are the poems of Dioscorides that show the strongest influence of Sappho, two of which, 6 and 3, happen to parallel the themes of Sappho's poetry. Dioscorides cites in his own poem on Sappho: 6.5 GP ὦ Ὑμέναιε (cf. 18.5 GP: ἦ καὶ Ὑμῖν Ὑμέναιος ἔχων εὐφεγγέα πεύκη) and 3.1 GP φίλ' Ἄδωνι (cf. 18.7–8 GP: ἦ Κινύρεω νέον ἔρνος ὀδυρομένη Ἀφροδίτῃ / σὺνθρηνος μακάρων ἱερὸν ἄλλος ὀρήϊς). *πότνια* of the first Adonean of fr. 1 V. is clearly recalled in *πότνια* of 18.9 GP: we wonder whether by a similar strategy Dioscorides has not also recalled this poem at 1.1 GP, not only in the theme of erotic *mania* (ἐκμαίνει ≈ Sapph. fr. 1.18 V.: μ[ανόλαι θ]ύμῳ), but also in recasting Sappho's ποικιλόθρονος as ποικιλόμυθος. ῥοδόχρους in 1.1 GP may be part of the same imitative strategy; while the word itself does not occur in extant Sappho, Sappho does appropriate this type of epic compound in βροδο- in her poetry (cf. fr. 96.8 V. βροδοδάκτυλος; fr. 58.19, 53 V. βροδόπαχυς). There is a suggestive parallel at Theocritus *Id.* 18.31 ῥοδόχρως Ἑλένα, in a poem especially imbued with resonances of Sappho. In a sense Dioscorides' poem on Sappho is unusually programmatic in that his explicit emulation in one poem is mirrored, obliquely, by his frequent imitation in others.

The New Posidippus (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309) preserves Sappho in epigram in a rather different sense, as a cultural heritage of song sung by young girls, and as epigrammatic imitation of choral lyric. The original editors of 51.5–6 AB, δάκρυσι δ' ὕμέων / κολλάσθω Σα[ρφῶι' αἰσμ]ατα, θεῖα μέλη, were hesitant to read this line as referring to the performance, specifically, of Sappho's poetry, and preferred understanding rather an analogical sense of "songs worthy of Sappho,"⁹⁹ but θεῖα μέλη must specifically refer to Sappho's poetry.¹⁰⁰ A second epigram

locus amoenus, the flowers, leaves and breath, from physical landscape to the landscape of Doris' body.

⁹⁸ The marked epanalepsis of this epigram (line 2 further defines the first word of line 1, line 3 the last word of line 2) recalls the balance of the sixth stanza of Sappho's poem, κα[ὶ γὰρ] αἰ φεύγει κ.τ.λ., where the second part of each line responds to the first.

⁹⁹ Bastianini-Gallazzi (2001: 171–2).

¹⁰⁰ As Battezzato (2003: 40) convincingly argues. Cf. Theocr. *Id.* 16. 44: θεῖος αἰοιδὸς

in the same collection, 55 AB, contains a second striking evocation of the lyric poet in a girl's tomb poem.

πάντα τὰ Νικομάχης καὶ ἀθύρματα καὶ πρὸς ἑώϊαν
κερκίδα Σαπφώϊους ἐξ ὁάρων ὁάρους
ῥίχeto Μοῖρα φέρουσα προῶρια· (1–3)

All of Nicomache's playthings, all her talk / in Sappho's manner at the
morning's shuttle, / Fate took away too early.

These lines recall the cultural memory of Sappho: girls' playthings,¹⁰¹ weaving,¹⁰² and discourse.¹⁰³ Di Benedetto has drawn attention to the poem's opening and Sappho fr. 104 V.: Ἔσπερε πάντα φέρῃς; clearly the epigram's pathos gains from the recall of Sappho's wedding imagery.¹⁰⁴ As in Nossis 11 GP, Posidippus recalls Sappho as both singer and song, as both lyric tradition and text. The conceit of his epigram on Doricha (122 AB) that Sappho is remembered both as poet and text he effects in his own epigrams that recall, in short elegiac couplets, both content and occasion of Sappho's songs.¹⁰⁵

Alcaeus

As a reading of Alcaeus, and of Alcaeus' later reception, Hor. *Odes* 1.32.5–12 highlights a dual character of Alcaeus' verse that becomes standard: Alcaeus is the poet of both *polis* and *eros*, his poetry is both that of civil unrest and erotic pleasure in the company of wine and young boys.¹⁰⁶ The loss of much of Alcaeus' erotic poetry sadly hampers our ascertaining his expected influence on homoerotic epigram. A few suggestive fragments remain, especially 368 V., which clearly evokes

ὁ Κήϊος, which evokes Simonides in the context of his poems. The editors' conjecture Σα[πφώϊα, which parallels 55.2 AB, Σαπφώϊους, accords with their interpretation; if we accept Lapini's reading (2003: 48, n. 51) Σα[πφούς ἄισμ]ατα, there is no ambiguity.

¹⁰¹ Cf. ἀθύρματα at Sapph. fr. 44.9, 63.8 V.; see further Pretagostini (2002: 122).

¹⁰² Cf. Sapph. fr. 102 V.

¹⁰³ ὄαρος is here more likely conversation than song; see Pretagostini (2002: 123–4).

¹⁰⁴ Di Benedetto (2003: 11); Sapph. fr. 104.1 V. is a dactylic hexameter; one wonders whether the final vowel sounds of Αὔως are partially recalled in Posidippus' ἑώϊαν.

¹⁰⁵ *Paragraphoi* in P.Oxy. 1787 fr. 3 col. II 3–14 and 15–24 (Sappho fr. 62–63 V.) mark these fragments in distichs; both poems are short. This sort of lyric is of especial interest as a model for literary epigram.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 4.71; Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.63; Athen. 687d.

the kind of erotic symposiastic setting of a long tradition of erotic epigram;¹⁰⁷ Theocritus' adaptation of Alcaeus fr. 366 V. at *Id.* 29.1–4 is suggestive of the memorialization of Alcaeus' lyric in a later period.¹⁰⁸ The image of resplendent armor in Alcaeus fr. 140 V. from his political or stasiotic poetry¹⁰⁹ has a clear imitative heritage in Hellenistic epigram. A trio of epigrams (Leonidas 25 GP (= *AP* 9.322), Antipater of Sidon 60 GP (= *AP* 9.323) and Meleager 120 GP (= *AP* 6.163)) recalls this fragment in evolving a theme of the warrior-god Ares indignant at the sight of pristine armor in his temple; as Bonanno has acutely shown in her 1990 study of these poems, each author retains some feature of the Alcaeus original while varying the later conceit (here beginning with Leonidas) of the outraged god. There may be an earlier imitation of this poem in epigram: Anyte 1 GP (= *AP* 6.123):

ἔσταθι τῷδε, κράνεια βροτοκτόνε, μηδ' ἔτι λυγρόν
 χάλκεον ἄμφ' ὄνυχα στάζε φόνον δαΐων,
 ἀλλ' ἀνὰ μαρμάρεον δόμον ἡμένα αἰπὸν Ἀθάνας
 ἄγγελ' ἀνορέαν Κρητὸς Ἐχεκρατίδα.

Stand here, man-slaying spear, and no longer / drip enemy blood around
 your dread point. / But at rest in Athena's high resplendent house, /
 proclaim the valor of the Cretan Echekratidas.

Anyte's proximate model is very likely the type of dedicatory epigram ascribed to Anacreon or Simonides;¹¹⁰ μαρμάρεον δόμον (3) seems too close to Alcaeus' line 2: μαρμαίρει δὲ μέγας δόμος to be merely coincidental. The spear is significantly the one major piece of weaponry absent in Alcaeus' list; remarkable too is Alcaeus' poem ending ἔσταμεν τόδε and Anyte's seemingly conventional opening ἔσταθι τῷδε. For Alcaeus' audience the armor serves as a reminder for valor to be

¹⁰⁷ κέλομαί τινα τὸν χαρίεντα Μένωνα κάλεσσαι | αἱ χρῆ συμποσίας ἐπόνασιν ἔμοιγε γένεσθαι ("I bid someone summon fair Menon, if I am to enjoy the symposium"). See Vetta (1982: 7–8), Liberman (2002: 246–7). Cf. also Alcaeus fr. 296b V.

¹⁰⁸ Alcaeus fr. 366 V.: Οἶνος, ὃ φίλε παῖ, καὶ ἀλάθεια, which Theocritus consciously casts as: 'Οἶνος, ὃ φίλε παῖ,' λέγεται, 'καὶ ἀλάθεια.' The same "motto," cited in a scholion to Plato's *Symposium* 217e, may be recalled in Asclepiades 18.1 GP (= *AP* 12.135): οἶνος ἔρωτος ἔλεγχος (see further Guichard (2004) *ad loc.*). There does seem to be a connection between Theocritus' use of the so-called Greater Asclepiad for three of his Aeolic Idylls, his Archaic model, and Asclepiades; see further Hunter (1996: 173–4), Acosta-Hughes (forthcoming 2007).

¹⁰⁹ On the term see Pardini (1991b: 268–9).

¹¹⁰ Gow-Page (1965:2) *ad loc.*; Gutzwiller (1998a: 57) notes the parallel of "Anacreon" 13 *FGE* (= *AP* 6.142) where Echekratidas is at the end of the final line (here of a distich).

undertaken; for Anyte's poem the strife of battle is now past. The later epigrams just mentioned that feature an Ares wrathful at slaughter that has *not* occurred are one possible further thematic development.

Much of Alcaeus' surviving poetry is song of exhortation that urges his companions now to political action, now to pleasure in drink and joy in the present moment. As a reading of Alcaeus in epigram, Asclepiades 16 GP (= AP 12.50) is one of the most vivid epigram recollections of a lyric poet.¹¹¹ Echoes of Alcaeus carefully placed throughout catch the reader's attention; as elsewhere in poetry of this period, retention of dialect forms particularly recalls, and marks variation from, the earlier model (cf. the Doric *ἄως* (5), *κομιστάν* (6), and *μακράν* (8)).¹¹² 16 GP transfers to epigram individual features of Alcaeus' symposiastic poetry, yet into a poem that is particularly definitive for Asclepiades:¹¹³

Πῖν', Ἀσκληπιάδῃ· τί τὰ δάκρυα ταῦτα; τί πασχεις;
οὐδ' ἐπὶ σοὶ μόνῳ κατεθῆξαι τόξα καὶ ἰοὺς
πικρὸς Ἔρως· τί ζῶν ἐν σποδιῇ τίθεσαι;
πίνωμεν Βάκχου ζωρὸν πόμα· δάκτυλος ἄως·
ἢ πάλι κοιμιστὰν λύχνον ἰδεῖν μένομεν;
†πίνομεν, οὐ γὰρ ἔρως† μετὰ τοι χρόνον οὐκέτι πούλυν,
σχέτλιε, τὴν μακράν νύκτ' ἀναπαυσόμεθα.

Drink, Asclepiades. Why such tears as these? What's wrong? / Harsh Cyprius has not taken you alone prisoner, / nor against you alone has bitter Eros sharpened his bow and arrows. / Why lie then, yet alive, in ash? / Let us drink Bacchus' pure wine. There is but a finger of dawn.¹¹⁴ / Or await we again the lamp that puts us to sleep? † We drink, there is no love† / fool, there is not much time left, before we will sleep a long night.

¹¹¹ We give Guichard's (2004) text of this poem; for the textual problems at line 3 *κατεθῆξαι* and line 7 *†πίνομεν, οὐ γὰρ ἔρως†* the reader is referred first to Guichard's commentary *ad loc.*

¹¹² Guichard (2004: 262). See Cassio (1993: 908); Sens (2004: 81–3).

¹¹³ Gutzwiller (1998a: 148–9) suggests this may have served as the *sphragis* of his collection.

¹¹⁴ The translation of *δάκτυλος ἄως*, evocative of both Alcaeus' *δάκτυλος ἄμερα* but also Homer's standard *ῥοδοδάκτυλος ἠώς*, is not entirely secure here; some scholars understand the time referred to here to be dawn, e.g., Gutzwiller (1998a: 148). For others, e.g., Page (1955: 307), De Martino and Vox (1996: 1317), the time in question is evening. At issue is whether Asclepiades is imitating or varying Alcaeus. See Guichard (2004: 267). Another parallel worth noting here is Sappho's *βροδόπαχυν Αὔων* in the ninth line of the new Sappho poem (P. Köln Inv. Nr. 21351 + P. Oxy. 1787).

Asclepiades closely recalls Alcaeus' sympotic poem fr. 346 V., from which he appropriates, and re-integrates, each element of the first line in lines 5–6 of his epigram: Πώνωμεν· τί τὰ λύχιν' ὀμμένομεν; δάκτυλος ἄμέρα. Two other poems of Alcaeus come into play here, fr. 335 and 38 V.; the latter, with its imagery of the underworld and sympotic addressee (line 1: Πῶνε[.....]Μελάνιππ' ἄμ' ἔμοι[.]. []), and of light (line 3: ἀ]ελίω κάθαρρον φάος), is particularly intriguing.¹¹⁵ This poem (which may be complete in 12 lines)¹¹⁶ appears to be in a glyconic meter with dactylic expansion; more pertinent to Asclepiades' imitation is the poem's distich structure. Whether the original was an erotic poem is unclear. Melanippus, the poem's addressee, is apparently the figure to whom Alcaeus, at Hdt. 5.95.2, announces his survival in battle and the loss of his shield—Herodotus identifies him simply as ἀνὴρ ἐταῖρος. The other features of Asclepiades' re-configuration, symposiastic setting, wine, exhortation, are all present in Alcaeus. Asclepiades has essentially reversed roles, and in so doing marks not only his relationship to Alcaeus, but comments on epigram's "reading" of earlier poetry. In 16 GP the poet is the addressee, whether, as many scholars argue, of an implied symposiastic companion, or himself;¹¹⁷ the general mortal state of Alcaeus' drinking songs evolves into the specific erotic state of the epigrammatist,¹¹⁸ the echoes of Alcaeus place Asclepiades in a direct symposiastic poetic tradition, and at the same time mark his reception of that tradition to define his own creation, the erotic epigram.

Anacreon

Anacreon's poetry has obvious affinities with Hellenistic epigram. A poet with international rather than local affiliations, Anacreon performed his poetry primarily for tyrants' courts of the sixth century, in some ways very much prefiguring the performance setting of much Hellenistic poetry.¹¹⁹ A number of the extant lyric poems, if complete, are quite

¹¹⁵ For this last observation we thank P. Bing.

¹¹⁶ See Liberman (2002: 33); Page (1955: 301).

¹¹⁷ Gutzwiller (1998a: 148–9); cf. however Di Marco (1997: 161–2). Guichard (2004: 262–3). Asclepiades 2 GP is an interesting comparandum, although here the advice is directed to the poem's addressee, a young girl.

¹¹⁸ Some scholars have read in Alcaeus fr. 38 a *carpe diem* theme (e.g., Page 1955: 302), but cf. Liberman (2002: 206).

¹¹⁹ J. Bruss draws our attention to Posidippus 9 AB on Polycrates' ring, where the

short, and metrically rather simple; word placement is very important (again, as in epigram). Anacreon's poetic dialect is at once literary and popular; his erotic interests are both homo- and heterosexual (and so in this sense Anacreon is not unlike Asclepiades or Meleager). The figure of Eros in Anacreon's poetry, while not the child of Hellenistic poetry, has features that clearly lend to that development. A certain distanced irony of narrative voice is markedly similar to some of the humor of Hellenistic erotic epigram. Among the surviving fragments are a few in elegiac couplets, and a significant number of epigrams were attributed to Anacreon (some of these are clearly later); again not so much the authenticity of these epigrams as the credibility of Anacreon as an epigram author is at issue in thinking of his influence on the genre.

The wealth of recall of Anacreon's poetry in epigram, particularly of some of the signal motifs of his lyric poetry is illustrative. One of these is the figure of Eros at play (fr. 357, 358, 398 *PMG*) which comes to have a long, self-reflective tradition in Hellenistic poetry beginning with Asclepiades;¹²⁰ indeed 15.4 GP (= *AP* 12.46), ὥς τὸ πάρος, might be read either in terms of the poem itself ("you, loves, will play heedlessly with dice as before") or in part metatextually (with ὥς τὸ πάρος both recalling the "Anacreontic" occasion (fr. 398 *PMG*) and also recalling, by variation, Anacreon's signal δηῦτε).¹²¹ Asclepiades evinces strong echoes of Anacreon, which may suggest something of the early evolution of erotic epigram from short lyric models. Dioscorides' treatment of Anacreon parallels his treatment of Sappho; an epigram that celebrates Anacreon the poet (19 GP = *AP* 7.31), and recalls individual poems, is complimented by frequent allusion to Anacreon in other epigrams.¹²² Meleager 20 GP (= *AP* 12. 119) is but one example of the type of *variatio in imitatione* that Anacreon occasions: the poem's opening lines recall both Anacreon's celebration of wine and his image of

figure of the singer is very likely Anacreon; see further Bing (2005: 121); Gutzwiller (2005b: 314).

¹²⁰ See esp. Pretagostini (1990).

¹²¹ See also 4.1 GP (= *AP* 5.158); συνέπαιζον; 17 GP (= *AP* 12.166) heightens several features of Anacreon's poem; a similar anaphora at Theocr. *Id.* 7.118–9 of βάλλετε, also with the Erotes as subject, evokes the same fragment of Anacreon; see further Acosta-Hughes (forthcoming 2007). On δηῦτε in Anacreon see Mace (1993) passim.

¹²² Some of the similarities of 19.1–4 GP and Anacreon (elegiac) fr. 2 W are striking; Dioscorides' poem also marks Anacreon's bisexual erotic gaze, one feature he shares with a number of epigram poets.

the charioteer of the soul (fr. 360 *PMG*)—here with Bacchus as the soul’s reinsman.¹²³

Conclusion

The section of P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309 entitled ἀναθηματικά preserves an epigram (37 AB) claiming association with a “voice-giving lyre,” a lyre that was further brought (to its present setting?) by a dolphin “worthy of Arion” (2: Ἀριόνιο[c; the reference is surely to the tale, told by, e.g., Herodotus, of Arion’s magical rescue by dolphins). In the epigram the lyre (or the poem, whichever is the object of dedication) and the lyric poet’s epithet are set up—and the voice-giving instrument is preserved in the epigram’s seeming inscription.¹²⁴ This “new” epigram is truly emblematic of Hellenistic epigram’s relationship to earlier lyric; the lyric voice is here “inscribed,” transferred to a later period and setting, and reconfigured for a later cultural use—at once given to a Hellenistic queen, and, *Arionios*, worthy of an archaic poet.¹²⁵

¹²³ The apposition of Dionysus/Eros in line 3: ἐν πυρὶ γενναθεὶς στέργεις φλόγα τὰν ἐν Ἑρωτι might distantly echo the last line of fr. 357 *PMG*: τὸν ἐμόν γ’ ἔρω- / τ’, ὦ Δεόνυσε, δέχεσθαι.

¹²⁴ See Stephens (2004a: 162–6).

¹²⁵ Cf. Posidippus 9 AB on Polycrates’ ring, which features the lyre of, apparently, Anacreon.

THE HELLENISTIC EPIGRAMS ON ARCHILOCHUS AND HIPPONAX

Ralph M. Rosen

Given the well known tendency of Hellenistic poets to situate their work in relation to poets and literary traditions of the past, it should come as no surprise to find a popular category of epigrams explicitly concerned with the poets of a by-gone era who had by the third century B.C. become classicized and canonical. Such epigrams could take a variety of forms, but broadly fell into two common types: those pretending to be tombstone epitaphs for famous poets now long dead, and those written in the form of inscriptions intended to accompany a statue of the poet.¹ The epitaphic epigrams are often witty, finely polished literary *jeux*, in keeping with contemporary aesthetics, and almost certainly not intended to elicit from the reader much in the way of funereal melancholy or wistful reflections on mortality, as certain sepulchral epigrams, both literary and inscribed, often did. Epigrams posing as subscriptions to statues of famous poets, as well, seem intended to raise a smile in the reader rather than to inspire any particularly deep reflection about their subject. But although slight in form and light in spirit, epigrams for famous dead poets reveal much not only about the literary tastes of the age, but also about the ways in which contemporary critics and readers conceptualized and evaluated the poetic genres that they had appropriated from distinguished practitioners of an earlier era.

As part of this *hommage* to a grand literary past, we should expect to find, as indeed we do, epigrams about poets who had become classics by the Hellenistic period—Homer, Hesiod, Aeschylus, Sophocles, to name just a few. Hellenistic scholars had begun to organize and assess the works of such classic poets, establishing canons and hierarchies of aesthetic value, and reifying poetic genres into increasingly fixed categories. In the wake of all this philological activity, it is no wonder that contemporary poets felt self-conscious about their own place within

¹ See most recently, Rossi (2001: 81–106). Also, Gabathuler (1937), Lausberg (1982: 259–75), Bing (1988b: 58–65) and (1988a), and Barbantini (1993).

a literary tradition that now had acquired an articulable history. The reverence shown for the poets judged to be the best within this history bears some similarity to modern attitudes toward Shakespeare or Dickens or Joyce—all towering literary figures whose legacy any serious writer in English must confront in one way or another, much as any Hellenistic poet who chose to write epic, for example, would have to confront Homer.

Somewhat more curious, however, are those epigrams that concerned two poets, Archilochus (seventh century B.C.) and Hipponax (sixth century B.C.), who composed *iamboi*, an essentially comedic genre, famous in antiquity for its predilection for obscenity, mockery and often aggressive satire, for its frequent amalgamation of high and low diction, and its fondness for parody of more “elevated” literature.² It is not so much that these poets had become particularly obscure by the Hellenistic period—Archilochus, in fact, had become in some circles, at least, a revered, canonical author even by the fifth century,³ and even the more pervasively rakish Hipponax enjoyed unbroken notoriety into the third century⁴—but their roguish posturing and playful irreverence might make them seem at first glance an odd subject for epigrammatic celebration. Were the epigrams on iambographic poets written out of admiration for this type of poetry? Were they intended themselves to mock such poets, or perhaps to offer serious commentary on the iambus? What aspects of the iambus were these epigrams trying to capture within their brief compass? As we shall see in this chapter, while the number of extant epigrams on Archilochus and Hipponax is relatively small, when taken together they offer a fairly consistent pattern of responses to the iambus, which accords well with the aesthetic sensibilities that we have come to associate with this period.

It is somewhat artificial, of course, to speak of Archilochus and Hipponax in the same breath as if they were almost interchangeable representatives of a uniform literary tradition. Aside from the fact that they were chronologically separated from each other by a century and came from different places (Archilochus was from Paros, Hipponax from Ephesus), their surviving fragments make it clear that the character of

² The fragments of Archilochus and Hipponax are collected in West (1989: vol. 1). For the text of Archilochus, see also Tarditi (1968); for Hipponax, see Degani (1991), with Degani (1984).

³ See Blumenthal (1922: 1–8), Rankin (1977: 1–5), Clay (2004).

⁴ See Degani (1973) and (1995).

each poet's work was quite distinct from the other. Archilochus, for example, composed in a variety of meters besides the iambus—many fragments of his elegies and epodes survive—while Hipponax only occasionally ventured beyond the choliambic meter.⁵ Archilochus' subject matter seems also to have been far more varied than Hipponax', and ancient audiences admired his political and quasi-philosophical ruminations almost as much as his satirical poetry. Theocritus wrote an epitaph for Archilochus which treats his poetry with only the highest praise (21 Gow = 14 GP = *AP* 7.664):

Ἀρχίλοχον καὶ στάθι καὶ εἴσιδε τὸν πάλαι ποιητάν
τὸν τῶν ἰάμβων, οὗ τὸ μυρίον κλέος
διήλθε κήπῃ νύκτα καὶ ποτ' ἄω.
ἦ ῥά νιν αἱ Μοῖσαι καὶ ὁ Δάλιος ἠγάπευν Ἀπόλλων,
ὥς ἐμμελὴς τ' ἐγένετο κήπιδέξιος
ἔπεά τε ποιεῖν πρὸς λύραν τ' αἰεῖδεν.

Stop and look at Archilochus, the ancient poet of iambs, whose enormous fame extends to the night and the dawn. To be sure, the Muses and Delian Apollo loved him, since he was musical and skilled both at composing verses and singing them to the lyre.

Theocritus here invests Archilochus with the stature of a Homeric poet, favored by the Muses and Apollo, without even a hint that he might be at all controversial.⁶ Hipponax, by contrast, seems to have been more self-consciously comedic, reveling in outrageous, often lurid narratives and casting himself as the central player in a variety of ram-bunctious interpersonal dramas.⁷ Despite their many surface differences, however, they shared certain fundamental qualities which ancient audiences were quick to pick up on. To begin with, as satirists, both poets freely engaged in mockery of others, speaking in the first person, and

⁵ E.g., the hexametric parody in Hipponax fr. 126 Dg.

⁶ Several details of this epigram suggest that Theocritus was engaging quite intimately with Archilochean iambus. The epigram is composed, for example, as an epode—a form associated with the iambographer—using meters for which Archilochus too was well known (“Archilocheans,” followed by iambic trimeter and iambic trimeter catalectic; see Gow-Page (1965: 2.532)). Note also the typically iambic, humorous sensory command εἴσιδε. Cf. Bing (forthcoming 2007) on Hermeias, who cites Archilochus fr. 109 W, Sousarion of Megara fr. 1 W, Callimachus *Iambi* fr. 191.1 Pf. and Phoenix of Colophon fr. 1.13–5. Theocritus also composed an epigram on Hipponax (13 GP = 19 Gow = *AP* 13.3), discussed below, which is similarly less aggressive than those of other Hellenistic epigrams on that poet (on which see discussion below).

⁷ On the character of Hipponax' poetry, see West (1974: 28–31), Degani (1984) and Gerber (1997: 79–88).

claiming to represent their “real” feelings. Typically, they would voice their indignation at the behavior of others, and would frequently blame them for their own material or emotional abjection. The language they used in the service of such narratives could be vituperative, acerbic, and explicitly obscene. Both were famous in antiquity as poets of obscene language (*aischrologia*, “shameful speech”), and it was this aspect of their work especially that made them controversial from early on.⁸

What seems to have captivated the ancient imagination most of all were the elaborately contrived stories of the poets’ feuds with various enemies. However varied or nuanced their poetry was, the first thing anyone would think of at the mention of either Archilochus or Hipponax was their targets. Archilochus railed against Lycambes and his daughters, while Hipponax attacked the sculptor Bupalus (sometimes with his brother Athenis, also a sculptor).⁹ The reasons for their attacks were the stuff of latter-day soap-operas and sit-coms—a wedding abruptly called off (Archilochus and Lycambes), rivalry over a woman (Hipponax and Bupalus), an incident of perceived disrespect (Bupalus allegedly sculpted an unflattering likeness of Hipponax)—and the gossipy, lurid nature of such material proved as irresistible to ancient audiences as it remains today. Indeed, certainly by the Hellenistic period, their personal feuds had taken on something of a life of their own independent of the actual poetry, as is evident from the fact that the story of Archilochus and Lycambes was routinely conflated with Hipponax’ contretemps with Bupalus. Just as Lycambes and his daughters were said to have hanged themselves out of shame after Archilochus excoriated them in verse, so too, as some testimonia maintain, did Hipponax drive Bupalus and his brother to a similar suicide. Even in antiquity, this “coincidence” seemed to some to be too good to be true, as we see, for example, in Pliny (*NH* 36.12) who objected to the story of Bupalus’ suicide on chronological and historical grounds.

Epigram doubtless found Archilochus and Hipponax attractive subjects in part, at least, simply because their famous feuds had become so emblematic, and the mere mention of Lycambes or Bupalus would have been sufficient to conjure up an entire body of poetry. In addition, however, it is likely that the epigrammatists found Archilochus

⁸ See, for example, Pindar’s famous repudiation of Archilochus at *Pythian* 2.52–6.

⁹ For the testimonia about these quarrels, see West (1989: 1.63–71) for Archilochus; Degani (1991: 3–9) and Rosen (1990) for Hipponax.

and Hipponax particularly rich because their narratives of abjection, self-righteous indignation and retaliation so consistently blurred the line between fiction and reality. When the iambographer claims so earnestly, if disingenuously or ironically, that his satire reflects personal experience, that his targets are in fact real people whose affronts to him leave him no other choice but to attack, his characters (including himself) take on an immediacy, and his causes an urgency, that has the effect of drawing audiences into an almost personal relationship with him. As a result, as the biographical traditions about iambographers make clear,¹⁰ iambus turns out to be a remarkably dynamic genre, cajoling its audiences into constructing a life for the poet and his characters outside of his poetry, even to the point of fantasizing about their interior lives and continuing the narratives of their lives from where the poet himself leaves off.

Nearly all of the Hellenistic epigrams that involve Archilochus and Hipponax strive for this kind of “updating” of their lives, imagining that these long-dead, archaic poets retain their acerbity even after death for anyone who reads the epigram. This is a subtle, but highly effective, strategy for maintaining a fiction that verbal aggression has a kind of transcendent force, and for breathing fresh life for a new era into archaic genres. The reader of the epigram is imagined suddenly to face the same risks as Archilochus’ or Hipponax’ targets, and so he or she must take care not to offend the poet even though he is dead.¹¹ This conceit is essentially a variation on the stories in each of their *vita*-traditions about how their iambs drove their respective targets to commit suicide, and testifies to their success at persuading audiences that their invectives had in their day consequences for the real lives of real people, whether or not they actually did.¹² The Hellenistic epigrammatists were clearly intrigued by the ways in which Archilochus and Hipponax played with the subjective voice of their iambs, the speaking “I” that characterized so much of their poetry, and explored the power

¹⁰ See below, n. 20, on the ancient biographical traditions of Archilochus and Hipponax.

¹¹ This is also a *topos* found in other epigrams not associated with the iambographers (e.g., Leonidas 74 GP = AP 7.480), but it has special point when used of an iambographer, whose retaliatory verbal aggression could always be held out as a real threat to the reader.

¹² On the principle that ancient *vitae* tend to reflect aspects of a poet’s work, see Lefkowitz (1981), generally, and 35–9 on the archaic lyric poets in particular.

of an indignant, aggressive stance against a putative target to create a peculiarly close bond with an audience.

The epitaphic epigrams to Archilochus and Hipponax, in fact, were so alive to the fiction that iambic poetry could actually have real-life consequences for its targets that they could have much fun with the conceit that even in death an iambic poet might still retain his verbal potency. This is why they often caution the passerby who encounters these tombstones to be careful not to rile the poet supposed to be lying beneath the ground. For woe to those who do not side with the poet, who fail to sympathize with his causes and the indignities he had to suffer during his life—those are the ones who will end up targets of the poet's wrath themselves. It is something of an absurdity, of course, to imagine an iambographer *redivivus* composing new poetry several centuries after his death against a nameless target,¹³ who could be anyone who happens to pass by the tomb, yet this is precisely the notion we find in several of the epigrams. Gaetulicus (late first century A.D.) offers an excellent example in his epigram to Archilochus (*AP* 7.71):

Σῆμα τόδ' Ἀρχιλόχου παραπόντιον, ὅς ποτε πικρὴν
 μοῦσαν ἐχιδναίῳ πρῶτος ἔβαψε χόλῳ
 αἰμάξας Ἑλικῶνα τὸν ἡμερον. οἶδε Λυκάμβης
 μυρόμενος τρισσῶν ἄμματα θυγατέρων.
 ἡρέμα δὴ παράμειψον, ὁδοιπόρε, μὴ ποτε τοῦδε
 κινήσης τύμβῳ σφήκας ἐφεζομένους.¹⁴

This is the sea-side tomb of Archilochus, who long ago was the first to dip his bitter muse in poisonous wrath, and to steep gentle Helicon in blood. Lycambes knows it for sure, who laments the hangings of his three daughters. Traveler, pass by calmly, and make sure you don't ever stir up the wasps that sit on his tomb.

The poet here implies that Archilochus is somehow different from other, more “normal,” poets—a violent, even murderous, intruder into the serene region of Helicon, the traditional locus of poetic inspiration. Insofar as Helicon is sacred space, infusing it with blood is an obvious gesture of pollution, and the metaphor here serves as an emblem of iam-

¹³ The epigrams themselves never explicitly say that the dead poet will compose poetry against the offending passerby, but it seems reasonable to assume that if the poet is roused from his deathly rest to attack someone, he would do so as he would when alive, namely with poetry.

¹⁴ Note the amusing play in lines 1 and 5, where we find *ποτε/ποτε* in the same metrical position. What Archilochus did “long ago” (*ποτε*) becomes a timeless threat to the wayfarer, who must take care not “ever” (*ποτε*) to stir up the wasps.

bus' transgressive power. In the finely focused rhetoric of the epigram, nothing else about Archilochus' poetry really matters—not his political poems, not his consolatory elegies, not even, really, his predilection for obscenity. To this epigrammatist Archilochus is simply a vituperative satirist, an angry, bitter poet responsible for the deaths of innocent girls. There is nothing unusual, of course, about poets recounting stories of human death and destruction, but it is quite extraordinary to accuse a *poet* of actually *causing* the deaths of others himself, as this epigram does. Archilochus, then, according to this conceit, was a murderer, his verses serving as his weapons. An epigram from later antiquity (Julian, *AP* 7.69), humorously notes that even the gatekeeper to the Underworld, Cerberus, had to be on his guard against Archilochus:

Κέρβερε, δειμαλέην ὑλακὴν νεκύεσσιν ἰάλλων,
 ἤδη φρικαλέον δεῖδιθι καὶ σὺ νέκυν·
 Ἀρχίλοχος τέθηκε· φυλάσσεο θυμὸν ἰάμβων
 δριμὺν πικροχόλου τικτόμενον στόματος.
 οἶσθα βοῆς κείνοιο μέγα σθένος, εὖτε Λυκάμβεω
 νηὺς μία σοι δισσὰς ἤγαγε θυγατέρας.

Cerberus, hurling your fearful bark at corpses, now it's your turn to be afraid of a terrifying corpse. Archilochus has died: watch out for the frightening passion of his iambi, born from a mouth full of bitter anger. You know the great strength of his rantings, since a single ship brought the two daughters of Lycambes to you.

Once again, the power of Archilochean poetry, its *sthenos*, is felt to transcend its original time, place and performative occasion. Suddenly, all the ranting (βοή = lit. "shouting") which, from one perspective, seems so specific to Archilochus' targets as they are depicted in his poetry, becomes, from another, much more broadly emblematic of a type of dyspeptic, aggressive personality whose influence extends far beyond his literary work. Iambus becomes conceptualized here, in other words, as a veritable "speech act," that is to say, as a form of discourse with real consequences: something actually does happen when a poet composes invective. Look, for example, as the last two lines of the epigram note, at the boat that carried the Lycambids to Hades. But the effect is not limited to the characters who inhabit the poems. While we may feel sorry enough for the fate of these and other victims of Archilochean invective, they serve ultimately as cautionary tales for a danger much closer to home, namely the constant threat that the iambic poet will direct his attack against anyone he meets at any time and in any place. Iambographers, after all, according to these epigrams, are people

with short tempers and a chip on their shoulders, and even Cerberus (however absurd the idea) could well end up like the poor daughters of Lycambes, driven to suicide by cruel, mocking words.

This characterization of the iambographer as an aggressor willing to attack indiscriminately and with little provocation was not simply formulated as a response to Archilochus and his poetic victims,¹⁵ but was also applied to Hipponax. Three epigrams survive which replicate with striking similarity the conceits we have seen in the epigrams about Archilochus; a fourth, by Theocritus, we will discuss separately below. All of the Hipponax epigrams pretend to be funerary epitaphs, and all address the hypothetical traveler who happens to pass by the tomb:

ὦ ξεῖνε, φεύγε τὸν χαλαζεπῇ τάφον
τὸν φρικτὸν Ἰππώνακτος, οὗ τε χά τέφρα
ἱαμβιάζει Βουπάλειον ἐς στύγος,
μή πως ἐγείρης σφήκα τὸν κοιμώμενον,
ὃς οὐδ' ἐν Ἄϊδι νῦν κεκοίμικεν χόλον
σκάζουσι μέτροις ὀρθὰ τοξεύσας ἔπη.

Stranger, flee from the terrifying tomb of Hipponax, and its hailstorm of verse. Even his ashes compose invective with an eye on his hatred of Bupalus, so make sure you don't awaken the sleeping wasp, who, even in Hades, has not put his anger to sleep, he who shot his verse head-on with limping meters.

(Philip of Thessalonica 34 GP *Garland* = AP 7.405)

Ἀτρέμα τὸν τύμβον παραμείβετε, μὴ τὸν ἐν ὕπνῳ
πικρὸν ἐγείρητε σφήκ' ἀναπαυόμενον.
ἄρτι γὰρ Ἰππώνακτος ὁ καὶ τοκεῶνε βαύξας
ἄρτι κεκοίμηται θυμὸς ἐν ἡσυχίῃ.
ἀλλὰ προμηθήσασθε· τὰ γὰρ πεπυρωμένα κείνου
ρήματα πημαίνειν οἶδε καὶ εἰν Ἄϊδι.

Pass quietly by the tomb of Hipponax, lest you awaken the wasp, bitter in sleep, who has for now left off. For not too long ago the passion that growled even at his parents¹⁶ has gone peacefully to sleep. But watch out! For even in Hades his fiery words know how to cause pain.

(Leonidas 58 GP = AP 7.408)

¹⁵ Some have thought that this characterization of Archilochus in later epigram derives from Callimachus' formulation in fr. 380 Pf. Further discussion and bibliography, below, n. 28.

¹⁶ The reading τοκεῶνε ("parents"), proposed by Headlam, for ms τοκέων is not at all secure, especially since there is no other evidence that Hipponax ever attacked his own parents. For discussion see Gow-Page (1965: 2.367).

Οὐδὲ θανὼν ὁ πρέσβυς ἔῳ ἐπιτέτροφε τύμβῳ
 βότρυν ἀπ' οἰνάνθης ἡμερον, ἀλλὰ βάτον
 καὶ πιγύεσσαν ἄχερδον ἀποστύφουσιν ὀδιτῶν
 χεῖλεα καὶ δίψει καρφαλέον φάρυγα.
 ἀλλὰ τις Ἰππώνακτος ἐπὶ παρὰ σῆμα νήηται
 εὐχέσθω κνώσσειν εὐμενέοντα νέκυν.

Not even in death does the old man let the gentle cluster of grapes from the vine grow on his tomb, but bramble and choking prickly pear which dries out the lips¹⁷ of wayfarers and their throats which are parched with thirst. But whenever someone goes by the tomb, let him pray that the corpse stay asleep and calmly disposed.

(Alcaeus 13 GP = AP 7.536)

Philip and Leonidas, in a metaphor that anticipates Gaetulicus' epigram on Archilochus, characterize Hipponax as a wasp who is currently dormant, but likely to be awakened by the slightest disturbance. Philip's epigram actually warns the reader to flee the tomb as soon as possible (humorously ironic advice, of course, if the traveler has actually stopped to read the inscription), while Leonidas suggests only that the reader pass by as quietly as possible so as not to wake up the sleeping "wasp" Hipponax. The diction and imagery used to describe Hipponax and his poetry in these epigrams will remind us of the epigrams on Archilochus: Hipponax is "terrifying" (φορικτόν, Philip 34.2 GP *Garland*), his iambs are poems of hate (ιαμβιάζει Βουπάλειον ἐς στόγος, Philip 34.3 GP *Garland*), in life he was full of anger and bitterness; his diction is "fiery" (πεπυρωμένα κείνου ῥήματα, Leonidas 58.5 GP), and so on. In Philip and Leonidas, as well, the reader is cautioned to avoid the fate of the poet's targets, who, like Lycambes and his daughters, were also said to have been driven to suicide by iambic attacks.

There can be no question that these epigrams are intended to be playful in their conceit that a dead iambic poet might suddenly rouse himself to attack anyone who happened by his tombstone, so it is perhaps not entirely appropriate for us to cross-examine their authors too strenuously about what their particular portraits of Archilochus and Hipponax might actually imply when we think through the details. Should it concern us, after all, that so many of the epigrams on these iambographers actually misrepresent the iambus as a poetry of *random* vituperation?¹⁸ That Alcaeus' epigram takes the idea a step further

¹⁷ Note Gow-Page (1965: 2.18–19).

¹⁸ As such, Fantuzzi and Hunter's principle (2004: 283–4) that "epigram replicated

still? (For here Hipponax is said to have found a way, even in death, to make any passerby miserable even without recourse to words!) There, the painful associations of iambographic poetry are transferred to the very plants that spring up around the tomb. Instead of a “gentle cluster of grapes from a vine” Hipponax has seen to it that only bramble and “choking prickly pear” grow on his tomb, which are explicitly intended to have an astringent effect on the lips and throats of thirsty travelers. What this means, then, is that even a “well behaved” passerby cannot avoid at least some brush with Hipponax’ *kholos*, no matter how careful he is not to wake the poet’s sleeping shade.¹⁹ These epigrammatists, then, in their zeal to emphasize the transcendent power of the iambus miss one crucial aspect of the actual archaic genre, namely that its practitioners regarded their poetic attack as a justified response to wrongs suffered at the hands of specific individuals; they did not, in other words, make it a policy to hurl abuse randomly and for no apparent reason. Archilochus, the story went, felt aggrieved at Lycambes and his daughters when Lycambes called off Neobule’s marriage to Archilochus; Hipponax, it seems, squabbled with Bupalus over a girlfriend, Arete, and likewise with their other targets—there was always some reason for an attack, and always a sense of righteous indignation so typical of satirists of all ages.²⁰

How to account, then, for the rather unnuanced portrait of Archilochus and Hipponax as incorrigibly cruel, indiscriminately irascible men that we find in some Hellenistic epigrams? Two possibilities seem open to us: we may simply conclude that this was felt to be the most amusing way to portray the iambographers, and leave it at that. In this case, there is no need to expect from the epigrammatist an “accurate” representation of the iambographer. But a second explana-

the archaic relationship with the poet that’s found in the original genre that’s being alluded to,” may not accurately apply to epigrams on iambic poets.

¹⁹ The traveler can certainly pray that the corpse remain asleep and well disposed, and this will allow him to escape without being *verbally* attacked by the poet; but the harsh flora growing on the tomb constitute a form of surrogate vituperation. Such vegetation seems to have been traditionally associated with misanthropes (such as Timon) in Greek epigram. See Fantuzzi (2000) and Rossi (2001: 297).

²⁰ See in general Rosen (forthcoming 2007: esp. ch. 1). For the ancient evidence about Archilochus and Hipponax that purports to recount the details of their relationships with their respective targets, see West (1989: 15–32 = Archilochus fr. 30–89), and Degani (1991: 3–9 = Hipponax *test.* 7–19). Recent detailed discussion in Brown in Gerber (1997: 51–69) for Archilochus; (84–8) for Hipponax.

tion seems more in keeping with the subtleties we have come to expect from Hellenistic poets, and offers richer insight into the ways in which these poets conceptualized the archaic iambus. This second approach, far from arguing that the Hellenistic poets misunderstood the dynamics of the archaic iambographers, would hold, in fact, that they were engaging directly with their poetics, sparring with them, as it were, over the very question of what invective poetry is all about. This is not to turn these little epigrams into nuggets of somber and sustained literary criticism, but only to suggest that these epigrammatists were very much interested in taking up the question of satiric indignation and the posture of self-righteousness that the iambographer would typically assume for himself. To put this another way, all the epigrams that portray Archilochus and Hipponax as indiscriminately vituperative may well be questioning, if banteringly, their claims to self-righteousness, as if to say, “You may want us to believe that your invective is justified, but can we always really be so sure? Is it possible that you couldn’t control your bile even if you wanted to?”

There are several reasons for suspecting that some such formulation as this might inform the Hellenistic epigrams about Archilochus and Hipponax, all of which, as we shall see, suggest on the part of our epigrammatists an appreciation of self-righteousness and moral indignation as defining ingredients of satirical poetry. We may begin by considering Theocritus 13 GP (= 19 Gow = *AP* 13.3) on Hipponax, which acknowledges, in essence, that Hipponax’ invective could claim some measure of justice for itself:

Ὁ μουσοποιὸς ἐνθάδ’ Ἰππῶναξ κεῖται.
εἰ μὲν πονηρός, μὴ προσέρχου τῷ τύμβῳ.
εἰ δ’ ἐσὶ κρήγυός τε καὶ παρὰ χρηστῶν,
θαρσέων καθίζεο, κῆν θέλης ἀπόβριζον.

The poet Hipponax lies here. If you’re a scoundrel, do not approach the tomb. But if you’re a good person and from good folk, sit down undaunted, and sleep, even, if you wish.

Like the other three funerary epigrams on Hipponax that we discussed above, this one addresses the traveler who happens upon the tomb and warns him that an unusual corpse is buried in the ground beneath. The difference here, however, is that Hipponax now is portrayed as a not altogether unsympathetic figure whose invective is limited to those who deserve it. Only the person who is *poneros* need have any fear of rousing the ire of Hipponax; the “good” person (κρήγυός τε καὶ παρὰ

χρηστῶν) has nothing to fear, and indeed might even fall asleep safely on the tomb if he wished. The epigram implies, in other words, that Hipponax' own targets, insofar as they were *poneroi*, fully deserved the abuse they received from him. This contrast between the "good" and "bad" passerby replicates the familiar polarities of iambus, which tends to divide the world into the poet's friends (good) and his enemies (bad), and in the course of making such distinctions highlights the poet's self-righteousness and indignation. As the epigram suggests, even audiences of posterity must worry about how their own moral character will measure up to the poet's censorious judgments. Rossi (2001: 298) has noted this "unusual distinction between 'good' and 'bad' wayfarers," and discusses the possibility that it was intended as a kind of "correction" to the attitude found in the epigrams to Hipponax by Leonidas, who had portrayed Hipponax as an unregenerate curmudgeon. Others have even hypothesized that the epigrams on Archilochus and Hipponax were inspired by a Hellenistic debate over the relative merits of each.²¹ Rossi herself is rightly skeptical of this idea—the little evidence that might suggest camps of "Archilochceans" or "Hipponactceans" is, as she notes, inconsistent and tendentious. These epigrams, she concludes, can certainly offer opinions about each iambographer individually without implying at the same time praise or blame of the other. Certainly, Theocritus 14 GP (= 21 Gow = *AP* 7.664) on Archilochus and 13 GP on Hipponax indicate that this poet, at least, had nothing but praise for *both* archaic iambographers.²²

It may or may not be the case, as Rossi believes (2001: 301), that Theocritus' epigram on Hipponax is meant to "correct" contemporary negative conceptions of that iambographer, but it must be said that this position can only be maintained if one assumes that the other epigrams on Hipponax are supposed to be "seriously" critical of him. Scholars have long noted—see Rossi (2001: 296, 301)—that the three epigrams on Hipponax discussed above seem to be variations on the popular epigrammatic *topos* of the "misanthrope"—Timon is perhaps the most famous example—whose misanthropy continues unabated even after death. Was Theocritus trying to say that Hipponax was not in fact a misanthrope after all, that to characterize him as such is to

²¹ See Rossi (2001: 299–301) with further bibliography.

²² See Rossi (2001: 323–6) on the popularity of Archilochus in the Hellenistic period.

misunderstand what iambus is? It is impossible, of course, to answer this question with any certainty, but it is perhaps worth pointing out that the epigrams of Leonidas, Philip and Alcaeus do not seem particularly interested in staking out a position on the actual poetics of the iambus, except to riff comically on the assumption that any invective poet must have a dyspeptic, misanthropic personality.²³ Moreover, there seems no need to assume that characterizing an iambic poet as a misanthrope, especially when the image is clearly intended to raise a smile in the reader, must be taken as serious criticism of his temperament. In fact, it seems just as likely that the “misanthropic” epigrams on Hipponax are actually intended to mock the person reading the inscription, implying playfully that he should flee the tomb because Hipponax will surely find something morally reprehensible about him.²⁴ Theocritus was probably not, therefore, “correcting” anything he found objectionable in contemporary portraits of Hipponax, but rather articulating a particularly Hellenistic analytical interest in how the iambus worked, why poets would engage in vituperation to begin with, and what distinguishes “legitimate” invective from unjustified attack.

Outside of epigram, we find Callimachus, most notably, exploring such concerns in his own extended homage to Hipponax, his collection of *Iambi*,²⁵ and we have ample evidence also of considerable scholarly activity on Hipponax and the iambus during this period—exegetical treatises, critical editions, and so forth.²⁶ Callimachus, in particular, seems to have been working out in his *Iambi* how one might write a kind of Hipponactean iambus for his own day, and even brought the iambographer back from the dead in two explicitly programmatic poems (1 and 13) to dramatize the discussion.²⁷ Throughout this work

²³ As Rossi (2001: 300–1) notes: “In the epigrams on Hipponax and Archilochus . . . no evaluation (in this case negative) of their *poetry* appears, since the attack is against the *person* of the two ancient poets, invariably portrayed in *all* these compositions in the guise of misanthropes modelled on Timon.”

²⁴ The conceit is somewhat reminiscent of the joke at the end of the *agon* in Aristophanes’ *Clouds*, where one of the antagonists, “Weaker Argument” (*Hēttōn Logos*), suddenly turns on the audience and jokingly accuses them all of being “buggers” (*euruprōktoi*, cf. 1090–104).

²⁵ Callimachus’ *Iambi* have been well served recently in Kerkhecker (1999) and Acosta-Hughes (2002). Lehnus (1989) and (2000) offers an exhaustive bibliography on the *Iambi* through 1999. See also Rosen (forthcoming 2007: ch. 5). For other Hellenistic poets working in iambics, see Degani (1995: *passim*), and Rossi (2001: 298–9).

²⁶ See Degani (1995: 107–12).

²⁷ For detailed discussion of these poems, see Kerkhecker (1999: 12–48, 250–70) and Acosta-Hughes (2002: 21–103); also Hunter (1997).

Callimachus is concerned with precisely the sort of generic questions about the iambus that the epigrams on Archilochus and Hipponax, in their brevity, can only imply. And like the epigrammatists, Callimachus seems above all interested in the question of what constitutes “legitimate” iambus, i.e., who has the “right” to attack a target, what sort of dictional and stylistic registers are appropriate to an iambus, and where the sympathies of a putative audience are supposed to lie. This is the literary-critical background that helps flesh out and contextualize the epigrammatic representations of Archilochus and Hipponax. But if the epigrams we have examined so far seem somewhat limited in the amount of actual detail they can offer on the matter of iambographic poetics, one further group of poems suggests even more explicitly that such topics were indeed in the air and on the minds of some epigrammatists.

We may recall here our discussion earlier of Gaetulicus’ epigram, which cast Archilochus as the murderer of Lycambes’ daughters and served as a warning to travelers not to stir up the dead poet’s wrath at the risk of suffering the same fate as the daughters of Lycambes. As we noted, this epigram offers an extreme, quite paradoxical, portrait of a poet otherwise regarded in the Hellenistic period as a canonical classic, and calls into question, surely with mock-solemnity, the justice of Archilochus’ invective against the Lycambids. This *topos* arose evidently quite early, as a papyrus fragment from the third century B.C. attests,²⁸ and inspired several epigrams which assume the voice of the suicide daughters attempting to exonerate themselves from the charges that Archilochus had leveled against them in his poems:

οὐ μὰ τόδε φθιμένων σέβας ὄρκιον, αἶδε Λυκάμβεω,
 αἶ λάχομεν στυγερὴν κληδόνα, θυγατέρες,
 οὔτε τι παρθενίην ἥσχόναμεν οὔτε τοκῆας
 οὔτε Πάρον, νήσων αἰπυτάτην ἱερῶν·
 ἀλλὰ καθ’ ἡμετέρης γενεῆς ῥιγηλὸν ὄνειδος
 φήμην τε στυγερὴν ἔφλυσεν Ἀρχίλοχος·
 Ἀρχίλοχον, μὰ θεοὺς καὶ δαίμονας, οὔτ’ ἐν ἀγυαῖς

5

²⁸ P. Dublin 193a, an extremely fragmentary papyrus, but which almost certainly concerned the Lycambids. See Bond (1952) for full discussion. Bond entertains the possibility that the papyrus preserves an actual fragment of Archilochus, although it is far too fragmentary to determine. Von Blumenthal (1922: 18–21) suggested that the story of the Lycambids was inspired by Callimachus’ harsh judgment of Archilochus in fr. 380 Pf. See discussion in Pfeiffer (1949–53: 1.306), Degani (1973: 85–8), and Rossi (2001: 324–5).

εἶδομεν οὐθ' Ἥρης ἐν μεγάλῳ τεμένει.
εἰ δ' ἦμεν μάχλοι καὶ ἀτάσθαλοι, οὐκ ἂν ἐκεῖνος
ἦθελεν ἐξ ἡμέων γνήσια τέκνα τεκεῖν.

10

We, the daughters of Lycambes here, who acquired a despicable reputation, by an oath that inheres in this tomb of the dead, swear that we shamed neither our virginity, nor our parents, nor Paros, the steepest of the holy islands. But Archilochus burst forth with frigid reproach and hateful rumor against our family. By the gods and spirits, we never laid eyes on Archilochus in the streets or in the great sacred space of Hera. If in fact we were wanton and nasty, that one would not want to have lawful children with us.

(Dioscorides 17 GP = AP 7.351)

δεξιτερὴν Αἴδαο θεοῦ χέρα καὶ τὰ κελαινά
ὄμνυμεν ἀρήτου δέμνια Περσεφόνης,
παρθένοι ὡς ἔτυμον καὶ ὑπὸ χθονί· πολλὰ δ' ὁ πικρὸς
αἰσχρὰ καθ' ἡμετέρης ἔβλυσε παρθενίης
Ἀρχίλοχος· ἐπέων δὲ καλὴν φάτιν οὐκ ἐπὶ καλὰ
ἔργα, γυναικεῖον δ' ἔτραπεν ἐς πόλεμον.
Πιερίδες, τί κόρησιν ἐφ' ὕβριστήρας ἰάμβους
ἐτράπετ', οὐχ ὁσίῳ φωτὶ χαριζόμεναι;

We swear by the right hand of divine Hades and by the gloomy bed of unmentionable Persephone, that we really are virgins even under the earth. That bitter Archilochus gushed forth with many shameful things against our virginity. And he turned the beautiful expression of his verses not towards fine deeds, but towards war with women. Why, Muses, did you turn his scathing iambs against girls, and so show your favor towards an impious man?

(Meleager (?) 132 GP = AP 7.352)

What makes these epigrams so fresh and witty is precisely their engagement with, and whimsical critique of, the very premises of iambographic poetry. To begin with, they implicitly question whether the moral high ground that every satirist assumes for himself is in fact legitimate. Could it really be “fair” that Archilochus’ accusations drove the poor girls to suicide and ruined their reputation forever? The daughters are made to object in these epigrams to Archilochus’ “frigid reproach” (ῥιγηλὸν ὄνειδος) against them, and the “hateful rumor” he disseminated about their family (φήμην...στρυγερήν). We learn from both epigrams that Archilochus must have accused the girls of sexual impropriety, and although the original Archilochean verses do not survive, we can easily imagine the indignant, morally self-righteous tone he must have taken against them. These epigrams, however, imagine what it might be like if such claims to self-righteousness were actually bogus, and

Archilochus was actually *unjust* in his ranting. Suddenly, in a complete reversal of the conventional narrative perspective of iambic invective, in which the poet enlists the sympathies of his audience in pursuing his “causes” against his targets, we seem to have the targets themselves becoming the abject, beleaguered ranter with justice on their side, in a cause against the poet! Archilochus, in the end, is turned into the villain, and becomes the target in this imaginary “anti-iambus.”

One might wonder what exactly would motivate such a flight of epigrammatic fancy: do these epigrams reflect genuine, serious criticism of Archilochean invective? Do they imply that Archilochean iambs were too harsh, and their moral pretences disingenuous? The slightly comic undertone of each epigram makes this a difficult position to maintain. They both, after all, seem to end with a quirky, amusing twist. Dioscorides’ epigram ends with the Lycambids invoking a rather pedestrian, sophistic argument from probability: “we couldn’t have acted as wantonly as Archilochus said we did, since if we had, he would never want to marry one of us in the first place”²⁹—thereby assuming, in other words, that Archilochus was a morally principled man; but of course they also need to paint him as a dishonorable and slanderous liar! The end of the second epigram suddenly shifts the blame from Archilochus himself to his muse, who, the Lycambids complain, “turned his aggressive iambs against girls.” If anything, these epigrams, I would suggest, seem to *continue* Archilochus’ original attack against the Lycambids in their own somewhat raffish way, for the very fact that these young women are portrayed as so riled up, and are reduced to playing a rather ineffectual role in a he-said-she-said melodrama, testifies, once again, to the conceit that Archilochean invective could be an enduring, invincible force. These epigrams, in short, humorously imply that if Archilochus was capable of driving young girls not only to commit suicide, but then even to write epigram in the underworld about their

²⁹ The apodosis of lines 9–10 of Dioscorides’ epigram is actually a present contrafactual condition, which would technically suggest that Archilochus was still, despite their current post-mortem residence in Hades, after one of them to marry him. I doubt, however, that the epigram is urging us to imagine the shade of Archilochus chasing after the Lycambids even in the underworld, and suspect the apodosis, which seems to refer to Archilochus’ desire to marry one of them while they were still alive, has been somewhat loosely attracted to the tense of the protasis, which emphasizes that their virtue endures very much into the present (i.e., “we’re not immoral now, and never were...”).

experience, iambic poetry must be extraordinarily dangerous indeed.³⁰ In the end, moreover, they display a remarkably nuanced understanding of iambographic poetics: they shrewdly hone in on the question of the iambicist's typical stance of self-righteousness by adopting the voice of his targets, the *komoidoumenoi*, and by making a show of repudiating the justice of his accusations against them. But the effort fairly backfires, for the impression of the iambographer that they leave us with—a roguish, salacious trickster figure—is precisely the sort of character that iambic poets are fond of assuming.³¹ The iambic poet (like so many satirical poets in other literary traditions as well) may claim to attack his targets with just cause, and expect his audiences to sympathize with him, but this hardly means that his causes actually had to be just, and indeed they are often most amusing when they appear questionable or ambiguous to begin with.

Most of the Hellenistic epigrams on poets and poetry, as we have seen elsewhere in this book,³² end up one way or another offering some commentary on literary genre. Given the tightly circumscribed parameters of the epigrammatic form itself, such commentary is usually pithy, sometimes fleeting, and not always especially profound. The epigrams concerning Archilochus and Hipponax likewise played with various questions of genre, but the idiosyncrasies of the iambus seemed to have been of particular interest to Hellenistic writers. This is hardly suprising, given the fact that satirical genres as a rule tend to be elusive, unstable, and slightly perverse, and we know that such literary qualities would be appealing to many in the Hellenistic period.³³ What makes iambus so different from other types of poetry, after all—and the aspect that seemed especially intriguing to the Hellenistic epigrammatists—was its aggressive, confrontational voice, and its comically disingenuous insistence on representing a subjective reality. This kind of poetry routinely tantalizes its audience with its slightly sociopathological undercurrent:

³⁰ See also Aeschion 1 GP (= AP 7.345), which plays on a similar theme: here the epitaph speaks in the voice of Philaenis, who defends herself against charges that she wrote scurrilous, immoral verses. For details, cf. Gow-Page (1965: 2.3–5). Aeschion's epigram on Philaenis also seems to have inspired Dioscorides 26 GP (= AP 7.450), on the same topic. In all these cases of epigrams are intended to vindicate the reputation of maligned women; the irony is that the very reputation that they seek to discredit remains fictively inscribed on stone.

³¹ On the iambic poet as trickster, see Miralles-Pòrtulas (1983: 9–50).

³² See in this volume Acosta-Hughes and Barbantani, Harder, and Fantuzzi.

³³ For a discussion of the aesthetic appeal of the iambus to Hellenistic audiences, see Degani (1973: esp. 79–82, and *passim*).

in substance and diction it can appear indecorous, scandalous, even cruel at times, and its practitioners want to pretend that their verses have an actual effect on real life.³⁴ Such poets seem to delight in this blurring of fiction and reality, and the result is a particularly vivid form of poetry that encourages its audience to see poet and target as *real* players in a *real* drama capable of taking on a life of its own. As we have seen in this chapter, the Hellenistic epigrammatists seem to have recognized that the iambus was virtually unique in this regard, for no other ancient genre had quite the same ability to be read in any age as if it could still affect its later readers as it did an original audience. The Lycambids and Bupalus may have been long dead by the Hellenistic period, but the poetry that killed them, as the epigrammatic conceit maintained, had lost none of its sting.

³⁴ For a general description of the literary dynamics of ancient iambus, see Brown in Gerber (1997: 11–78).

EPIGRAM AND THE THEATER

Marco Fantuzzi

The entire Hellenistic vogue for epigrams on great literary figures of the past shares, as has been aptly remarked, “a common impulse with the great contemporary projects of literary classification, such as the *Pinakes* of Callimachus: namely the wish, on the one hand, to engage the past . . . , but also the need to assert control, to master a past that was viewed as unattainably, at times oppressively distinguished. That mastery, however, often involves wholesale abridgement, truncation, even evisceration.”¹ Both aspects of this controlling relationship constitute forms of appropriation. Even the most sympathetic forms of epigrammatic re-enactment of literary history in miniaturized “pen-portraits” challenged the monumental sepulchral portraits that, in most cases, the pseudo-epitaphs on poets affected to describe; they also challenged the complexity of the deceased author’s achievements through the *reductio ad unum* of a pithy appraisal, adapting to the brevity of epigram a literary judgment of the sort that might otherwise be realized as an expanded essay. Needless to say, however, abridgement, truncation, and evisceration were forms of more invasive, and even deforming, mastery.

At least three of the most important epigrammatists of the third and second centuries, Callimachus, Asclepiades and Dioscorides, dealt with dramatic authors (whether contemporary or of generations past), as well as theatrical activity in general, in a way that primarily stresses their self-asserting mastery. Other epigrammatists broach the topic with the gentle tone of admiration and celebration that most often characterized epigrams written for other poets of the past—for the third century B.C. we have at least ten epigrams of this kind celebrating dramatic authors.² Drama, though, was certainly not the genre most

¹ Bing (1988a: 123).

² The main texts are: two epigrams on Sophocles, usually ascribed, in spite of some doubt, to Simias of Rhodes, an older contemporary of Callimachus, 4 and 5 GP (= AP 7.21 and 7.22); Nossis 10 GP (= AP 7.414) for Rhinthon; Phalaecus 3 GP (AP 13.6) for Lycon of Scarphea, favorite comic playwright of Alexander the Great; the epigram on Cratinus AP 13.29, variously ascribed to Nicaenetus of Samus, 5 GP, or to Theaetetus, Demetrius of Halicarnassus, or Asclepiades; Theocritus 17 GP (=

fêted in epigram, which (understandably) lavished more attention on the poets of shorter lyric and elegy.³ Thus it is surprising to find the systematic interest of P.Petrie II 49b = *SH* 985,⁴ an anthology of the third century B.C. that contained at least nine tetrastichs composed on individual dramatists or individual tragedies and comedies (the names Aristarchus, Astydamas, and Cratinus are clearly legible). It is possible that the anthology represents a collection of epigrams which prefaced texts of single dramatic works, and was edited by a philologist or librarian for practical reasons.⁵

The fashion for celebratory epigrams on poets of non-theatrical genres, on the other hand, counted both Asclepiades and Callimachus among its followers: see, e.g., Callimachus 55 GP (*ap.* Strabo 14.638) on the cyclic poet Creophilus, or Asclepiades 28 and 32 GP (= *AP* 7.11 and 9.63) for Erinna, poetess of the *carmen breve*, and Antimachus the epicist, respectively. These two epigrammatists, however, never commemorated a stage poet of the past, concentrating instead on a partial presentation of theatrical activity marked by what appears to be intentional minimalism. This subtle resizing of theater's bygone grandeur, and in particular of the potential for greatness available to current writers engaged in this genre, represents another of the many points of contact between the poetics of Callimachus⁶ and his (probably older) contemporary Asclepiades. This may signal epigram's intent, as a substantially new literary genre, to define itself and broadcast its own poetics vis-à-vis the characteristics of theater, one of the most glorious

AP 9.600), for Epicharmus; the epigram/elegy for Philicus *SH* 980; another epigram ascribed to Theocritus, 4 GP (= *AP* 6.339), and datable to the beginning of the third century, commemorates a certain Damomenes' dedication of a tripod and statue (or relief) to the god Dionysus.

³ Antipater of Sidon, e.g., besides his two epigrams for Homer, and one each on Orpheus and Antimachus, offers a practical encyclopedia of lyric, with his five epigrams on Anacreon, three on Sappho, and one each on Ibycus, Pindar, and Erinna. Cf. Acosta-Hughes and Barbantani in this volume.

⁴ There is an excellent new edition by Maltomini (2001).

⁵ Cf. Lloyd-Jones and Parsons (1983: 502 ad fr. 985) and Cameron (1993: 8). Indeed they can be seen as predecessors to the verse-*hypotheseis* which survive for some comedies.

⁶ Other passages of Callimachus' poetic works betray an opinion of theater, not to mention of contemporary theater, anything but generous: *Iambus* 2, where of τραγωδοί (likely tragic actors, non authors) he says that τῶν θάλασσαν οἰ[κεύντων] ἔχο[υ]σι φωνήν (fr. 192.12–3 Pf.); cp. fr. 215 Pf., τραγωδὸς μούσα ληκυθίζουσα, on the basis of which it is usually believed that Callimachus denounces the language of tragic actors (and/or authors) as resoundingly pompous.

(and still most enthusiastically pursued) literary genres of contemporary Alexandria.

Asclepiades and Callimachus, however, each wrote an epigram about pupils dedicating theatrical masks, 27 (= *AP* 6.308) and 26 GP (= 6.310) respectively. The masks are dedications made with the typical youthful ingenuousness of boys, emphatically not the famous tragedians of the past, who were often remembered in conjunction with their glorious competitive victories (the *Didaskaliai* of Aristotle, Callimachus' *Pinax* for dramatic authors, and the theatrical entries of the *Marmor Parium* are organized chronologically by competition; the names of tragic and comic poets should be associated with their victories more than any other type of ancient author, barring the epinician poets); nor the victorious tragedians of contemporary dramatic competitions. The focus, rather, is the young pupils who, at least in the case of Asclepiades 27 GP (= *AP* 6.308), were indeed "victors"—in agons that were merely contests between boys (νικήσας τοὺς παῖδας, 1). Hence the emphasis on the triviality of the prizes.⁷ Furthermore, Asclepiades' and Callimachus' children boast of achievements connected merely with reproducing, and not creating, dramatic texts: handwriting (Asclepiades), or erudition and a fine memory (Callimachus). As for the masks themselves, Callimachus underscores their nature as gifts that are in one or more respects "alienated" and uncomfortably out of place.

Asclepiades 27 GP (= *AP* 6.308)—

Νικήσας τοὺς παῖδας, ἐπεὶ καλὰ γράμματα ἔγραψεν,
 Κόνναρος ὀγδώκοντ' ἀστραγάλους ἔλαβεν,
 κάμῃ χάριν Μούσαις τὸν κωμικὸν ᾧδε Χάρητα,
 πρεσβύτην θορύβῳ θῆκ' ἐνὶ παιδαρίων.

Connarus, on winning the boys' contest, since he wrote such pretty letters, received eighty knucklebones, and in gratitude to the Muses he hung me up here, the comic mask of old Chares, amid the hubbub of the boys.

—is the dedication to the Muses of a comic mask by a young boy, Connarus, who bested his schoolmates in a handwriting competition, perhaps specifically in the transcription of a scene from comedy in which the character Chares (for example) played a part.⁸ The mask is

⁷ On contests between young students, Guichard (2004: 344–5).

⁸ Dedications made following competitive victories—when different from the prize actually won by the victor—usually consisted of an object symbolic of the victory itself: cf. Sens' forthcoming commentary on Asclepiades of Samos.

of an elderly character and as such clearly incongruous with the hubbub of the young boys.⁹ It is possible that κωμικόν in this context has a double sense, denoting on the one hand the subject of the comic mask, but connoting on the other the additional humor of this mask of an old man, so unbefitting amid the clamor of children. The sense of another of Callimachus' epigrams seems analogous (*AP* 6.311 = 27 GP = 49 Pf):

Τῆς Ἀγοράνακτος με λέγε, ξένε, κωμικὸν ὄντως
ἀγχεῖσθαι νίκης μάρτυρα τοῦ Ῥοδίου
Πάμφιλον, οὐκ ἐν ἔρωτι δεδαυμένον, ἥμισυ δ' ὅπτῃ
ἰσχάδι καὶ λύχνοις Ἰσιδος εἰδόμενον.

Tell, stranger, that I, the mask of Pamphilus, am dedicated here as a truly comic witness of the victory of Agoranax the Rhodian, in the theatre. I am Pamphilus, but not burnt by love, and rather resembling a dried fig and the lamps of Isis.

Again the comic mask is meant to be the “comic witness” to a comic actor’s (or more likely author’s) victory. In a letter to Phaniass (*Ad familiares* 2.13 (= 93 Shackleton Bailey)), Cicero calls Phaniass a κωμικὸς μάρτυς (a truthful witness), in accord with the stock “witness” role in New and Roman Comedy. But in Callimachus 27 GP, “truthful comic witness” cannot mean really “truthfully,” or at least not this alone (ὄντως, potentially ironic, supports the notion of ambiguity). Even if the exact significance of the image of “lamps of Isis” is not clear, the epigram’s *pointe* is that the mask is “of poor quality.”¹⁰ As the opposition ἥμισυ δ(έ) shows, the face on the mask is different or worse than should be, parodically distorting the emaciation typical of lovers. Thus it does not fulfill its duty qua dedication, but rather plays on the authority of its *persona loquens* and the reliability of its purchaser—a kind of joke played often by Callimachus in his epigrams.¹¹ We know from Polybius 12.13.3 (= *FGrH* 566F35b) and from Aelius Aristides, *Against Plato, in Defense of the Four* that there was a clear-cut tradition that evidence mined from the comic poets was viewed as especially unreliable, apparently because it tended toward parodic distortion of characters and facts. Thus the

⁹ Cf. Gow-Page (1965: 2.136) and Guichard (2004: 347). The interpretation according to which θόρυβος might mean κρότος, namely the applause of the schoolmates for Connarus’ victory, is less probable.

¹⁰ Thus D’Alessio (1997: 1.259).

¹¹ Cf. 24 GP (= *AP* 6.147); 25 GP (= 6.149); 40 GP (= 7.522); Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 316–8).

phrase “truthfully comic witness” may have a double meaning: the mask should have been the “truthful witness” typical of comedy, at least in the intentions of its dedicator, so as to effectively perpetuate the memory of his dramatic victory. What the mask actually offers, however, is unreliable testimony, just as parodic and disfiguring as that which the comic playwrights tended to provide.

A similar incongruity afflicts the mask of “gaping” Dionysus in Callimachus 26 GP (= *AP* 6.310), whose setting and situation is analogous to Asclepiades 27 GP.¹² The epigram’s subject is another dedication by a young pupil, Simus, whose father’s name, Miccus or “The Little One,” is similarly childish. It is reasonable to suppose that this mask would also have been dedicated in a classroom.¹³

Εὐμαθίην ἤτεῖτο διδοῦς ἐμὲ Σῖμος ὁ Μίκκου
ταῖς Μούσαις, αἱ δὲ Γλαῦκος ὅκως ἔδοσαν
ἀντ’ ὀλίγου μέγα δῶρον. ἐγὼ δ’ ἀνὰ τῇδε κεχηνῶς
κεῖμαι τοῦ Σαμίου διπλόον ὁ τραγικός
παιδαρίων Διόνυσος ἐπήκοος· οἱ δὲ λέγουσιν
“ἱερὸς ὁ πλόκαμος,” τοῦμὸν ὄνειαρ ἐμοί.

Simus, son of Miccus, when he gave me to the Muses, prayed to be good at learning, and they gave it to him like Glaucus, a great gift in return for a little. I hang dedicated here, the tragic mask of Dionysus, yawning twice as much as the Samian’s Dionysus as I listen to the boys, who go on saying: “My hair is holy,” telling me my own dream.

It seems likely that the initial request for εὐμαθίη—in the study of tragedy, as the dedication to Dionysus shows—communicates an allusive wink from Callimachus at one of the earlier pseudo-epitaphs written in celebration of the great tragedians of the past. I suggest that with this word Callimachus refers his reader to Simias’ epigram on Sophocles, 5 GP (= *AP* 7.22), in which ivy, rose and vine are entreated to bloom around the tomb of Sophocles εἵνεκεν εὐμαθίης πινυτόφρονος (5), a quality he practiced in the company of the Muses or Graces. The εὐμαθίη is what both Simias’ Sophocles and Callimachus’ Simus had

¹² The reference to “Samian” Dionysus may allusively underscore the idea that Callimachus is establishing himself in competition with the model of the epigram by Asclepiades of Samos discussed above: cf. in Sens’ forthcoming commentary on Asclepiades his introduction to 27 GP.

¹³ In a context in which the emphasis on the world of children is fairly strong, it is unlikely that this name is coincidental: the name, or rather nickname, Miccus “no doubts means ‘Baby’ and has pursued its owner from the nursery into adult life” (Gow-Page (1965: 2.182)).

received from the Muses (a play on Simias may underlie the name Simus in Callimachus)—but it is not at all the same gift. εὐμαθίη is itself a technical word foreign to archaic and classical poetry, and uncommon outside of these: before Simias and Callimachus, the word is attested only a few times in Plato and once in Aristotle, always with the meaning “facility at learning,” never a particularly exceptional gift. It is therefore an objectively strange word for defining the greatness of Sophoclean tragedy.¹⁴ If Callimachus were indeed calling Simias’ epigram to mind, it is suggestive to think that he intentionally used this word—a strange one when used by Simias in the context of Sophocles and his Muses—to refer (more properly) to the “facility at learning” of Simus the pupil and his Muses. Callimachus thus first of all “corrects” Simias, in keeping with his usual practice as a *poeta doctus*, by using the word εὐμαθία to define a quality more expected of a schoolboy than of Sophocles (indeed, to make the point, it is as if Callimachus sends Simias back to school as Simus). Further, he implicitly evokes a panorama of contemporary theater in which the tragic εὐμαθία was no longer the extraordinarily creative εὐμαθία evoked by Simias for Sophocles, but the reproductive εὐμαθία of school boys who learned selections from the classic theater by heart (one thinks of the handwriting, or the comparable activity of transcription, at which Asclepiades’ Connarus excelled).

The imagery used to represent the mask is also the best imaginable for leading the reader to think of a slightly despondent Dionysus. Here Dionysus is portrayed as “gaping,” as at a Samian temple documented by Pliny (*NH* 8.57–8), supposedly erected by a certain Elpis, who one day came upon a lion with its jaws wide open. Having escaped to the safety of a nearby tree but still afraid, Elpis invoked Dionysus, and then realized that the lion stood with its mouth agape simply because of a bone stuck in its jaw. He dislodged the bone, and received from the lion everlasting gratitude in return. We thus have a myth that portrays a Dionysus-lion in a difficult situation and in need of the intervention of a terrified mortal—a case much different from that of the Dionysus-lion who, in a single moment, overpowered an entire crew of pirates in the *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* (7). We also have a Dionysus mask

¹⁴ Both Meleager 129.8 GP (= *AP* 12.257.8) and Leonidas of Alexandria 4.4 *FGE* (= *AP* 6.325.4), perhaps following Simias and Callimachus, use the word to define one of their virtues, but, as Hellenistic poets, they could have used it to praise the learnedness found in their work.

which, with its enormous gaping mouth (the opening is “double” that usually represented, 3–4), exacerbates an already awkward grimace, and would inevitably have evoked both the unflattering behaviors that χάσκειν implies in Greek: on the one hand and more often that of “wishing/awaiting impatiently” (with a frequent connotation of gullibility and disappointed hopes, as illustrated also in the proverb λύκος ἔχονεν), on the other of “yawning from boredom.”¹⁵

The final phrase actually seems to recall Dionysus’ bored reaction to the consequences of having once done the favor of mediating between students and the Muses. Youths reciting pieces of tragedy by heart (the phrase cited by Callimachus is Euripides, *Bacch.* 494) is surely something one would expect the god of tragedy to listen to with pleasure, not least of all because it is he who would be at the center of attention—or at least this would have been the thinking of the pupils who may have even performed their recitations in the presence of his mask. At the same time, however, the reader may also suppose that hearing the same pieces of the scholastic curriculum repeated over and over would have bored Dionysus and provoked the yawning pose in which the mask represents him.

The very doubleness of Dionysus’ reaction seems underscored by a little pun found in the last three words of the epigram. The standard expression is “you are telling me my own dream,” in the sense “you are repeating to me what I already well know,” and thus requires ὄναρ or ὄνειρον, the normal forms of this noun in the meaning “dream.” But for our epigram the *AP* documents the form ὄνειαρ, normally = “profit, advantage,” even if there are at least a couple of attestations in Greek of ὄνειαρ having the meaning of “dream.”¹⁶ I believe that Callimachus deliberately introduces an ambiguity between the sense “dream” and the more expected meaning of the form ὄνειαρ = “profit, good.” The *pointe* of the epigram would thus be the implication that, for the mask of Dionysus found inside that classroom, his only *pleasure* (ὄνειαρ) coincided with his bored (re)hearing of what was *well known* to him (ὄναρ), namely the pupils’ recitation of verses, which formed the stereotyped school selections from the great classics of the past.¹⁷

¹⁵ For parallels, cf. Headlam and Knox ad Herod. 4.42.

¹⁶ Anonymous *AP* 7.42.1; Eustathius, *Comm. ad Hom. Il.* 1877.64.

¹⁷ On the relevant phenomenon of the anthologies of dramatic texts in the Hellenistic age, cf. Gentili (1979).

Callimachus also speaks of the theater from a second distorting and reductive perspective. While Callimachus does not speak of the glory won by dramatic authors of the past or present, three of his epigrams (57 GP (= *AP* 9.565), 58 GP (= *AP* 9.566), 59 GP (= *AP* 11.362)) have as their principal and implicit theme defeat in dramatic competition or fear thereof. That Callimachus deliberately differentiates himself from the tradition of celebratory epigram is made certain by his clear negation of one of its frequent motifs, found in the famous epigram for Theaetetus, 57 GP (= *AP* 9.565):

Ἦλθε Θεαίτητος καθαρὴν ὁδόν. εἰ δ' ἐπὶ κισσόν
τὸν τεὸν οὐχ αὖτη, Βάκχε, κέλευθος ἄγει,
ἄλλων μὲν κήρυκες, ἐπὶ βραχὺν οὐνομα καιρόν
φθέγγονται, κείνου δ' Ἑλλάς ἀεὶ σοφίην.

Theaetetus walked in an untrodden road. If this path does not lead, Bacchus, to your ivy, the heralds shall call the names of others only for a brief season, but Hellas shall proclaim his wisdom for ever.

Achieving the ivy crown of Dionysus as a symbol of victory was a most frequent topos in many epigrams of the early and mid-third century about past dramatic authors.¹⁸ The Pythagorean/mystery origin of the image of Theaetetus' road as "pure" (= "untrodden") is certain in light of Parmenides' proem or of Pindar's *Paean* 7b and *Ol.* 6.23,¹⁹ and it is tempting to think that Callimachus here sets up an analogy, and simultaneously a difference, between the Dionysiac nature of dramatic competition and Theaetetus' peculiar purity as an initiate: "the new way of Theaetetus and the traditional dramatic way relate to each other as the way of the mysteries and the way of public cults do, the esoteric-elite way *vs* the vulgar way."²⁰ If other epigrammatists glorified those who won the crown of ivy, Callimachus asserts that the true glory was possessed by Theaetetus: as a loser in the theater, he did not possess

¹⁸ Simias 4.3–4 GP (= *AP* 7.21.3–4) and 5.1–2 GP (= *AP* 7.22.1–2), Phalaecus 3.1–4 GP (= *AP* 13.6.1–4), Nossis 10.3–4 GP (= *AP* 7.414.3–4), Nicaenetus 5.5–6 GP (= *AP* 13.29.5–6), and Anonymous *SH* 980 (epitaph for the poet of the Pleiad Philicus, in which the celebration of his piety as an initiate to the mysteries of Dionysus and uninterrupted dancing crowned by ivy seems to replace the absent mention of his glory as a tragic poet by possibly implying that the latter was a natural outcome of the imitation: cf. Fantuzzi (2006b)).

¹⁹ See above all D'Alessio (1995b).

²⁰ Cf. Asper (1997: 55).

the Dionysian ivy,²¹ but nevertheless knew his own “pure” road, one not often traveled and thus in harmony with the aesthetic expressed in Callimachus 2.1–4 GP (= *AP* 12.43.1–4) or fr. 1.25–28 Pf.

It is of little importance whether Callimachus arrived at such a detached or reductive vision of dramaturgy as a result of one or more personal failures in this arena. We know from Suidas that among Callimachus’ works there were also “satyr-plays, tragedies, comedies,”²² and we can imagine that Callimachus 59 GP (= *AP* 11.362) represents the poet’s joking conclusions about one or more of his own unsuccessful attempts at theater.²³

Εὐδαίμων ὅτι τᾶλλα μανεῖς ὄρχαῖος Ὀρέστας,
 Λεύκαρε, τὸν λῖαν οὐκ ἐμάνη μανίαν
 οὐδ’ ἔλαβ’ ἐξέτασιν τῷ Φωκέος ἄτις ἐλέγγει
 τὸν φίλον· ἀλλ’ αἱ χῆν δρᾶμ’ ἐδίδαξε μόνον,
 ἦ τάχα κα τὸν ἐταῖρον ἀπώλεσε· τοῦτο ποιήσας
 κήγῳ τὼς πολλῶς οὐκέτ’ ἔχω Πυλάδας.

Orestes of old—dear Leucarus—was happy in this, that, mad in other matters, he was not mad with my madness, nor did he have to apply the test to the Phocian, which is the trial of a friend. But, had he produced even a single piece, he would have lost his companions. I have done this, and, in fact, I no longer have most of my Pyladeses.

The epigram derives no small part of its humor from the fact that the chosen *exemplum fictum* of a failed tragic author is also a character who was the protagonist of many tragedies of the classical period. Orestes would have served this function most likely in a tragedy in which he was one of the characters. The specific paradigm of Orestes, an extremely popular character of the classical theater, possibly hints at Euripides’ tragedy potentially admired by Callimachus as experimental,²⁴ and might imply that it was crazy—and hazardous for your friendships—to produce the umpteenth *Orestes*. Although nothing could be more powerful than a real Orestes cast in the part of Orestes, even he would

²¹ Allowing the possibility that Callimachus knew the epitaph for Philicus, his epigram may imply that Theateteus did *not* have the εὐσέβεια of the pious Dionysiac *mystes* who also could tread the walk of life or art equally.

²² κ 227, 3.19.24–5 Adler.

²³ According to Thomas (1979: 188 n. 32), on the basis of Callimachus 59 GP, “we may suggest that he experimented with drama at an early stage, but, with the evolution of his poetic theory, subsequently found such forms unacceptable.”

²⁴ See lastly Saïd (2001).

flop, because his play would (ironically) seem a boring repetition of its preceding literary reinterpretations; Callimachus' failure would thus be a foregone conclusion!²⁵

But to view Callimachus' epigrams on the theater simply as rancorous protests against a literary genre at which Callimachus himself did not succeed would be an all-too simple and reductive biographical reading. It is more likely that Callimachus was also indirectly promoting his own poetics. This deliberate strategy is clear in at least 58 GP (= *AP* 9.566):

Μικρή τις, Διόνυσε, καλὰ πρήσσοντι ποιητῇ
 ῥῆσις· ὁ μὲν “νικῶ” φησὶ τὸ μακρότατον,
 ᾧ δὲ σὺ μὴ πνεύσης ἐνδέξιος, ἦν τις ἔρηται
 “πῶς ἔβαλες;” φησί· “σκληρὰ τὰ γινόμενα.”
 τῷ μερμηρίζαντι τὰ μῆνδικα τοῦτο γένοιτο
 τοῦπος· ἐμοὶ δ', ὦναξ, ἡ βραχυσυλλαβίη.

A successful poet, Dionysus, is a man of few words. The most he says is “I win.” But he whom your auspicious breath favors not, if he is asked “What luck?” says, “Things go hard with me.” Let such phrases be his who broods on fancied injustice. But mine, o Lord, be the few syllables.

This epigram is often understood as a sort of superstitious move on Callimachus' part, an augury of success for one of his dramatic productions. But Callimachus seems rather to be invoking the authority of Dionysus, traditionally linked with elevated style and drama, only to lure him onto the terrain of poetics characterized by brevity, one of his values elsewhere. Thus what at first blush seems a wish for his own victory as dramatic author is in fact yet another declaration of poetics, in line with that found for example in the “Prologue against the Telchines”: the praise of brevity at 6 is preceded by the half-joking wish at 5–6 that Callimachus' poetic adversaries, villainous individuals accustomed to “meditate upon unjust thoughts,” may taste the bitterness of defeat and thus be compelled to use the long phrase which is three times as long as the νικῶ of a victor (σκληρὰ τὰ γινόμενα). This is as much as Callimachus says explicitly, but the sympathetic reader would probably also infer that these rival poets were not brief when writing poetry either, and would have included brevity among τὰ μὴ ἔνδικα.

²⁵ Our epigram may therefore enter into the same line of criticism of reworkings of classical theater to which, e.g., Archimedes (*sive* Archimelos) 1 *FGE* (= *AP* 7.50) belonged—its last distich may even echo Callimachus.

In the last line Callimachus as passionate champion of his personal poetics consciously supplants the Callimachus who seems concerned about the fortune of one of his plays: although the epigram is largely about dramatic victory and defeat, at the end we may wonder whether *brachysyllabia* was actually, from beginning to end, the true heart of the epigram.

Before Antipater (see above, n. 3), Dioscorides was the author who, more than any other, seems to have first conceived of writing a sort of literary history in epigrams. He has left pseudo-epitaphs on Sappho, Anacreon and the Archilochian daughters of Lycambes, as well as five epigrams on five different authors of tragedy, satyr-play and comedy: three archaic or classical, Thespis (20 GP = AP 7.410), Aeschylus (21 GP = AP 7.411), Sophocles (22 GP = AP 7.37); and two contemporary, Sositheus (23 GP = AP 7.707) and Machon (24 GP = AP 7.708). In spite of appearances, however, this panorama is radically skewed toward the figures of more remote literary history.

Dioscorides 20 GP explores tragedy's origin with its *protos heurètes* Thespis:

Θέσπις ὅδε, τραγικὴν ὃς ἀνέπλασα πρῶτος αἰοιδὴν
 κωμήταις νεαράς καινοτομῶν χάριτας,
 †Βάκχος ὁ τετριθὺν κατάγοι χορὸν ᾧ τράγος ἄθλων
 χῶττικὸς ἦν σύκων ἄρριχος ἄθλον ἔτι.†
 οἱ δὲ μεταπλάσσουνσι νέοι τάδε· μυρίος αἰῶν
 πολλὰ προσευρήσει χᾶτερα· τὰμὰ δ' ἐμέ.

I am Thespis, who first modelled tragic song, inventing a new diversion for villagers, and Bacchus...(?), whose prize was still a goat and a basket of Attic figs. Now my juniors remodel all this; countless ages will beget many new inventions, but what's mine is mine.

Subsequent tragic poets could not have existed without Thespis (as the author essentially reminds us in the last distich of this epigram); thus 21 GP, dedicated to Aeschylus, begins by affirming Thespis' crucial priority and so explicitly presupposes the text of the previous poem for Thespis:

Θέσπιδος εὔρεμα τοῦτο· τὰ δ' ἀγροῖωτιν ἀν' ὕλαν
 παίγνια καὶ κώμους τούσδε τελειοτέρους
 Αἰσχύλος ἐξύψωσεν, ὁ μὴ σμιλευτὰ χαράζας
 γράμματα, χειμάρρῳ δ' οἷα καταρδόμενα,
 καὶ τὰ κατὰ σκηνὴν μετεκαίνισεν. ὦ στόμα πάντων
 δεξιόν, ἀρχαίων ἥσθ' αἱ τοι ἡμιθέων.

This is the invention of Thespis. But the greenwood jokes and revels were raised to greater perfection by Aeschylus who carved letters not neatly chiselled, but as if water-worn by a torrent. In matters of the stage he was also an innovator. O mouth in every respect accomplished, you were one of the demigods of old!

Dioscorides abridges the various accounts of the Aeschylean innovations through the fairly short and elusive phrase τὰ κατὰ σκηνὴν μετεκαίνισεν. The details of the history of drama here are so generalized that different scholars have seen the epigram as reflecting either the evolutionary theory of tragedy as developing from a primitive σατυρικόν (the idea supported by Aristotle),²⁶ or conversely an Alexandrian critical re-elaboration of that theory, according to which the satyr-play was first invented by Pratinas in the early fifth century (cf. *TrGrF* 4T1).²⁷ What our epigrammatist emphasizes most is the potent and unembellished “sublimity” of Aeschylean *language*. The verb chosen for defining the perfection Aeschylus brought to earlier dramatic forms, ἐξύψωσεν, calls to mind Aristophanes’ definition (*Ran.* 1004) of Aeschylus as πρῶτος τῶν Ἑλλήνων πυργώσας ῥήματα σεμνά; the description of Aeschylus’ style at 3–4, ὁ μὴ σμιλευτὰ χαράξας, defines Aeschylus in opposition to the way that Aristophanes had spoken, in the context of Euripidean style, of σμιλεύματα ἔργων (*Ran.* 819); and the final synecdoche of Aeschylus as the στόμα πάντων δεξιόν recalls Dionysus’ wish for a poet δεξιός (*Ran.* 1121).

From the last distich of 22 GP, we can also tell that Dioscorides knew of the evolutionary theory of tragedy, according to whose Aristotelian schema Aeschylus perfected the form, while Sophocles embodied absolute perfection itself:

Τύμβος ὅδ’ ἔστ’, ὦνθρωπε, Σοφοκλέος, ὃν παρὰ Μουσῶν
 ἱρὴν παρθεσίην ἱερὸς ὦν ἔλαχον.
 ὅς με τὸν ἐκ Φλιοῦντος ἔτι τρίβολον πατέοντα
 πρίνινον ἐς χρύσειον σχῆμα μεθηρμόσατο
 καὶ λεπτὴν ἐνέδυσεν ἀλουργίδα· τοῦ δὲ θανόντος
 εὐθετον ὀρχηστὴν τῇδ’ ἀνέπαυσα πόδα.
 — Ὅλβιος, ὡς ἀγαθὴν ἔλαχες στάσιν· ἡ δ’ ἐνὶ χερσὶ
 κούριμος ἐκ ποίης ἥδε διδασκαλίας;

²⁶ Pohlenz (1926 [repr. 1965]).

²⁷ See lastly Glucker (1973). The two perspectives are, however, less incompatible than they have often been assumed; cf. Webster *ap.* Pickard Cambridge (1962: 96).

—Εἴτε σοὶ Ἀντιγόνην εἰπεῖν φίλον οὐκ ἂν ἀμάρτοις
εἴτε καὶ Ἥλέκτραν· ἀμφοτέραι γὰρ ἄκρον.

This is the tomb of Sophocles which I, his holy servant, received from the Muses as a holy trust to guard. It was he who, taking me from Phlius where I still trod the prickly leaves from the oak tree, wrought me into a creature of gold and clothed me in fine purple. On his death I ceased from the dance and rested my light foot here.—Blessed are you, how excellent your post! And the mask of a girl in your hand with shaven hair as of a mourner, from what play is she?²⁸—Say Antigone if you want, or say Electra: in either case you are not wrong, for both are supreme.

The known accounts of the evolutionary theory always emphasize Aeschylus' "incompleteness," or rather less-than-complete perfection, compared with his successor.²⁸ Dioscorides, though, with his archaizing sympathies, notes no imperfection in Aeschylus, nor does he explicitly state Aeschylus' inferiority to Sophocles (though notice the subtlety of the word choices of *τελειότερος*, used for Aeschylus' output, and *ἄκρον* for Sophocles').

The focus of epigram 22 is not, however, solely on Sophocles' achievement as a tragedian. A dialogue epigram, its speaker for the first six lines is a satyr, who "stopped" forever (he is a statue after all) on Sophocles' tomb to express his gratitude because the great dramaturge had transported him far from his humble, rural origins in Phlius (and so from the more primitive forms of the satyr-plays written by Pratinas of Phlius), causing the satyr to become a plusher figure, now gold-adorned and dressed in lavish purple.²⁹ Naturally enough this satyr is particularly concerned with the development of his own kind. With verses 7–8, however, his unnamed interlocutor shifts the subject to tragedy by inquiring about the tragic mask the satyr holds in his hand. It depicts a woman with short hair: is it that of Antigone or Electra? The satyr replies (9–10) that neither interpretation offends the eminence of Sophocles, since the tragedies of both women represent the zenith of the art. Given Dioscorides' interest in satyr-play, confirmed in 23 GP (see below), it seems likely that the epigram compares the technical

²⁸ See in particular *Vita Aeschyli* 16 and Quintilian, *Inst.* 10.66–8.

²⁹ The actors who played the *sileni* in the Dionysiac procession organized by Ptolemy II in 275/4 actually wore red or purple mantles and a golden crown of ivy and bore *oinochoae* made of gold, while the satyrs had their skin dyed purple (cf. Callixenus Rh., *FrGrH* 627F2 = Athen. 197–9); the *φοινικοῦν ἱμάτιον* also belongs to satyr costumes, according to Pollux 2.118.

refinement of Sophocles as satyr-playwright with the tragic perfection of Sophocles' *Antigone*, or *Electra* (ἄκρον, 10). It is less likely, on the other hand, that Dioscorides is referring throughout to the evolution of tragedy from satyr-play, or describing the primitive satyr's transformation into a tragic actor (that Dioscorides followed Aristotle's theory in 21.1–3 GP is by no means certain).

While epigrams 21 and 22 GP may implicitly measure Aeschylus' ability in tragedy against Sophocles', Dioscorides far more explicitly compares Sophocles' achievement as poet of satyr-play with that of Sositheus, celebrated in epigram 23 GP. Indeed, epigrams 22 and 23 GP, on Sophocles and Sositheus, respectively, are as tightly linked to each other as 20 and 21 GP.³⁰ Even the beginning of 23 GP, κήγώ (an opening similar to the τοῦτο in the initial phrase Θέσπιδος εὖρεμα τοῦτο of 21 GP), establishes a precise intertextual cross-reference through the καί between the satyr who speaks from the tomb of Sophocles (in 22 GP) and the satyr who celebrates Sositheus:³¹

Κήγώ Σωσιθέου κομέω νέκυν, ὅσσον ἐν ἄστει
 ἄλλος ἀπ' αὐθαίμων ἡμετέρων Σοφοκλῆν,
 Σκιρτὸς ὁ πυρρογένειος. ἐκισσοφόρησε γὰρ ὦνήρ
 ἄξια Φλιασίων, ναὶ μὰ χοροῦς, Σατύρων
 κῆμ' ἐν τὸν ἐν καινοῖς τεθραμμένον ἥθεσιν ἤδη
 ἤγαγεν εἰς μνήμην πατρίδ' ἀναρχαίσας,
 καὶ πάλιν εἰσώρμησα τὸν ἄρσενά Δωρίδι Μούσῃ
 ῥυθμόν, πρὸς τ' αὐδὴν ἐλκόμενος μεγάλῃν
 ῥέπτα δέ μοι θύρσων τύπος οὐχερὶ καίνοτομηθεῖς
 τῇ φιλοκινδύνῳ φροντίδι Σωσιθέου.

I too, red-bearded Scirtus the Satyr, guard the body of Sositheus as one of my brothers guards Sophocles on the Acropolis. For he wielded the ivy-bough—yea by the dance I swear it—in a manner worthy of the Satyrs of Phlius, and restoring ancient usage, led me, who had been reared in new-fangled fashions, back to the tradition of our fathers. Once more I forced the virile rhythm on the Doric Muse, and drawn to the high voice... (?) introduced by the mind of Sositheus, which likes to risk.

³⁰ It is difficult to follow Sutton (1973: 174) about avoiding association of these two epigrams. Cf. Bing (1988b: 39–40); Cresci (1979: 252); Fortuna (1993: 238–40, 242, n. 22).

³¹ Indeed κήγώ here is the literary counterpart to what can be seen in monument groups when an inscription on one monument refers to another on a neighboring monument: cf. Bing (1988b: 40) and Fantuzzi (2007).

Here a satyr explicitly refers to his “brother” on the tomb of Sophocles (1–2), but he does so by way of contrasting him with the later dramatist, who knew how to write plays worthy of the satyrs of Phlius, i.e., plays once again worthy of Pratinas. Sophocles’ perfection and refinement are thus compared to Sositeus’ archaizing rediscovery of the origins: whose is the truest glory?

The literary-historical development presupposed by these two epigrams, when read together (as the first distich of 23 GP expressly invites), does not so much foresee continued progress down a path, but a backtracking along it. The imagery of the Sophocles epigram makes the reader think that the perfecting of satyr-play costume reached a “stopping point” with Sophocles, before Sositeus put it back on the right track, reversing course toward Phlius. Dioscorides does not thereby understate the technical perfection, i.e., of the costumes, attained by the Sophoclean satyr-play—the phrase Dioscorides uses for “halted my step,” spoken by the Satyr on Sophocles’ tomb (5–6: τοῦ δὲ θανόντος / εὐθετον ὀρχηστὴν τῇδ’ ἀνέπαισσα πόδα) may even echo what Aristotle says about how tragedy achieved technical perfection: πολλὰς μεταβολὰς μεταβαλοῦσα ἡ τραγῳδία ἐπαύσατο, καὶ ἔσχε τὴν αὐτῆς φύσιν (*Poet.* 1449a14–5). Rather the epigrammist suggests that post-Sophoclean satyr-drama did not attain further perfection before Sositeus turned it back toward the past.

That Sophoclean stopping point is both explicit in the satyr’s “halted my step” and implicit in his “golden” (i.e., “lavish”) “aspect” (σχῆμα): he is immortalized, but also immobilized by his statue. While all statues are in an obvious sense static, the poem underscores this quality in a very deliberate way. If we did not have the Sositeus epigram, we might infer that Dioscorides believed that satyr drama had continued to imitate the Sophoclean standard or had declined as a result of decadent indifference to it—essentially the two possible perspectives on tragedy that Aristotle’s near total silence on fourth century theater leaves open to readers of the *Poetics*. But the epigram on Sositeus causes us to reconsider the satyr’s stopping on the tomb of Sophocles in very different terms. It is a preamble to future movement, but movement backward—as if to say that on the road toward technical and formal perfection the development of the satyr-play had been arrested because it was not able to (and should not?) proceed beyond Sophocles; instead, through Sositeus satyr-play returned to the robust rudeness of its origins. In short, while it is likely that Dioscorides was familiar with Aristotle’s evolutionary idea of tragedy, according to which ἡ τραγῳδία ἐπαύσατο when it had

achieved formal maturation, he evidently grafted this concept onto a more nuanced and personal idea of the history of theater: that is, he integrated the progressive evolution traced by Aristotle into a sort of regressive-primitivistic vision that privileges Sositheus' rediscovery of the ancient roots of satyr-play.

What Dioscorides thought, on the other hand, about tragedy's vitality following the "height" (ἄκρον) reached by Sophocles, we cannot say. Nothing prevents us from supposing that he composed epigrams for contemporary tragedians, just as he wrote on Sositheus the satyr-poet and Machon the comic poet: certainly the fact that he chooses not to comment on Sositheus' activity as a tragedian—avoiding, in other words, a combined discourse of the sort we saw for Sophocles—suggests that he was not particularly enthusiastic about Sositheus' tragic output. Only Sophoclean tragedy is presented as the aesthetic "height" of the genre, and it is portrayed as such by someone who, as a satyr, has no personal interest in the genre and can thus be objective. The history of satyr-drama, by contrast, is represented both in terms of the perfection of its costumes, with no affirmations of aesthetic value, and through the subjectivity of the satyr, who is, of course, himself content with the high refinement of the dress. It is difficult to tell whether our author was also partial to this luxurious enrichment of satyr costume, which the satyr obviously finds pleasing. A passage of Lucian indicates that dressing someone who is πρίνις ("rustic") in a soft ἀλουργής ("purple") mantle might seem, at least to some people, inappropriate. It is a serious fault, Lucian tells us (*hist.conscr.* 8), not to know how to keep the attributes of history and poetry separate, introducing into history the embellishments that belong to poetry:

ὥσπερ ἂν εἴ τις ἀθλητὴν τῶν καρτερῶν τούτων καὶ κομιδῇ πρίνινον ἀλουργέσι περιβάλοι καὶ τῷ ἄλλῳ κόσμῳ τῷ ἑταιρικῷ καὶ φυκίον ἐντρίβοι καὶ ψιμύθιον τῷ προσώπῳ. Ἡράκλεις, ὡς καταγέλαστον αὐτὸν ἀπεργάσασαίτο αἰσχύναν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐκεῖνον.

it is as if you were to dress one of our tough, rugged athletes in a purple dress and the rest of the paraphernalia of a pretty light-o'-love and daub and paint his face. Heavens! how ridiculous you would make him look, shaming him with all that decoration.

According to Dioscorides' satyr, it seems more "natural" and "correct" that Sositheus restored the style of Pratinas, and through his archaizing caused the "Doric Muse" to return (πάλιν) to a "masculine rhythm" and "powerful voice"—a clear contrast to the "delicate purple" in

which Sophocles had dressed his satyrs.³² Along these same lines, the satyr stresses that Sophocles' tomb, along with his "brother" satyr who guards it, is found ἐν ᾧσται (23.1 GP):³³ that location serves implicitly to contrast the natural affinity of Sositheus and his satyr for the "country" (Phlius, and thus the satyr-plays of Pratinas, were depicted as rustic in 22.3–4 GP).³⁴

In summary, in spite of his great appreciation for the expressive power of Aeschylus, Dioscorides pays little attention to his concrete technical scenographic reforms; he does not expressly endorse the technical refinement of costume in the Sophoclean satyr-play (it is a pleasurable luxury through the subjective eyes of satyrs); on the other hand, Sositheus' archaizing, and in particular his "masculine rhythm" and "powerful voice," are assessed positively (an appreciation that may be perceived as objective, or at least authorial, because the satyr who clearly voices it has nothing to gain from this "rhythm" and "voice," as opposed to the Sophoclean satyr, who delights in his more luxurious costume).

The archaizing classicism favored by Dioscorides could not be clearer or more crucial to his conception of theater, especially if one takes into account the contrast with the evolutionary perspective that apparently dominates the epigrams on Thespis, Aeschylus and Sophocles.³⁵ This

³² It is likely that the non-urban primitivism of Sositheus the satyr-poet refers at least in part to the *Daphnis or Lityerses*, which seems to have had a pastoral setting (Daphnis was the bucolic character par excellence): cf. Günther in Krumeich, Pechstein and Seidensticker (1999: 603) and now Cozzoli (2003: 285–91).

³³ In Attic poetry ᾧσται was common antonomasia for Athens, but this antonomastic use would have been strange for an Alexandrian epigrammatist to use of a tragedian who had worked mainly in Alexandria of Egypt, even if he was born in the Alexandria of the Troad and was thought to have assumed Athenian citizenship (cf. Webster (1963: 536))—in Egypt ᾧσται could be used antonomastically, but there it obviously referred to Alexandria (cf. P.Hal. 1.89, 95, 97 and *Inscriptions métriques de l'Égypte gréco-romaine* 62.3 Bernard, of the third century B.C.; Philostr., *Vita Apoll.* 5.24; Steph.Byz. s.v. ᾧσται); in any case it seems that Sophocles was buried in Decelea and not in Athens.

³⁴ A similar contrast between the urban setting of tragedy and the rural setting of satyr-play was probably a part of the Hellenistic speculation that we also find presupposed by Horace, *Ars poet.* 244–7, and Vitruvius, *Arch.* 5.6.9.

³⁵ Dioscorides' perspective calls to mind Pliny the Elder's statement in *NH* 34.52 about Hellenistic bronze sculpture, or figurative art in general, in tune with the classicism of the neo-Attic school that affirmed itself around the middle of the second century B.C.: *cessavit deinde* (scil. with the end of the school of Lysippus and Praxiteles after 296–3) *ars ac rursus Olympiade CLVI* (156–3) *revixit*; it is reasonable to date this passage to a Greek source not too distant from the date of the supposed art revival—Apollodorus of Athens?—because of the obscurity of the names of the artists to which

last feature is actually useful to Dioscorides only in as much as it serves to present the work of Aeschylus in an even more positive light: on the one hand he does raise to a higher level those things that Dioscorides calls primordial, rural *παίγνια* in 21.2 GP. He does so, however, not through greater structural-technical refinement (details that are central in other historical profiles of theater, but of little importance to Dioscorides), but through his sublime dramatic language—*παίγνια*, after all, both “joking” and “light poems,” would have rung in Hellenistic ears as above all the opposite of “serious” or “solemn” poetry. What Dioscorides truly favors is clearly enunciated in the epitaph for Machon, 24 GP (= AP 7.708):

Τῷ κωμωδογράφῳ, κούφη κόνι, τὸν φιλάγωνα
 κισσὸν ὑπὲρ τύμβου ζῶντα Μάχωνι φέροις·
 οὐ γὰρ ἔχεις κύφωνα παλίμπλυτον ἀλλὰ τι τέχνης
 ἄξιον ἀρχαίης λείψανον ἠμφίεσας.
 τοῦτο δ' ὁ πρέσβυς ἐρεῖ· “Κέκροπος πόλι, καὶ παρὰ Νεῖλῳ
 ἔστιν ὅτ' ἐν Μούσαις δριμύν πέφυκε θύμον.”

Light earth, give birth to ivy that loves the stage to flourish on the tomb of Machon the writer of comedies. For you hold no re-washed cloak, but he whom you cover is a worthy remnant of ancient art. This shall the old man say: “O city of Cecrops, sometimes on the banks of the Nile, too, the strong-scented thyme of poetry grows.”

Besides Sositheus, Dioscorides is clearly most fond of this other Hellenistic dramatist, Machon. His works did not consist in worn out (*παλίμπλυτον*) repetition of motifs and forms from current or earlier theater, but are living “remains” of the “ancient” comic *technē* which had apparently been in disuse: in a discourse analogous to Nossis’ on Sappho,³⁶ Dioscorides thus elevates Machon to a level of near parity with classic Athenian comedy, and has the poet affirm with pride that every so often the Nile, too, is capable of *re*-producing the aggressive tone of the language of Athens’ Old Comedy.³⁷

it is connected and the absence of the names of later and much more famous artists who had similar tendencies. Cf. Preisshofen (1978: 269–71) and Citroni (2003).

³⁶ Nossis 11 GP (= AP 7.718): ὦ ξεῖν', εἰ τὸ γε πλεῖς ποτὶ καλλίχορον Μιτυλήναν / τῶν Σαπφοῦς χαρίτων ἄνθος ἐναυσόμενος, / εἰπεῖν ὥς Μούσαισι φίλαν τήν τε Λόκρισσαν / τίκτεν· ἴσαις δ' ὅτι μοι τοῦνομα Νοσσίς· ἴθι, “Stranger, if you sail to Mytilene of the lovely dances to be inspired by the flower of Sappho’s graces, say that a woman of Locris bore one dear to the Muses and to her; you may know that my name is Nossis. Go.” Cf. Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 15–6).

³⁷ Attic “thyme” is also attested in Quintilian, *Inst.* 12.10.25 and Lucian, *hist. conscr.* 15 as the “spice” that gave the Attic tradition its “perfume.”

Perhaps it is only a fluke of Dioscorides' transmission that an epigram on Euripides is missing from the series—even if I believe that it would have been difficult for Dioscorides to conceptualize a space for this tragedian, when he so closely connected the satyr of Sositheus with the satyr of Sophocles, and defined the tragic work of Sophocles as ἄκρον. But what space can there be, before Machon, for the “bourgeois” language of the theater of Euripides or Menander, or for the “modern” Hellenistic theater in general, within the ideal framework evident in Dioscorides? Little, I believe.

Neither Callimachus the epigrammatist nor Asclepiades utters a word on the glory of the theater of the past, and contemporary theater in general is little valued in third century epigram. They rather evoked an image of contemporary dramatic activity that highlighted its most reductive and negative aspects. Dioscorides' position regarding the history of theater is more clearly articulated, but he is not too different in his deconstruction. He appreciates a few modern authors of the stage, but only insofar as they do not seem too modern. In 20.5–6 GP Dioscorides has the founding father of theater admit that, in the history of the genre, μυρίος αἰὼν πολλὰ προσευρήσει χῶτερα. But the dismissive tone of this very phrase of Aeschylus turned out to lump all later *heureseis* together, as if the epigrammist himself clearly found most of these new *heureseis* not even worthy of mention.³⁸

³⁸ Consult Fantuzzi (2006a) and (2007) for further analytical details and bibliography. The English form of the text was improved by Johanna Hanink; English translations of Greek passages usually presuppose the relevant Loeb editions, with modifications.

PHILOSOPHERS AND PHILOSOPHY IN GREEK EPIGRAM

Dee L. Clayman

Though philosophy, in one form or another, was central to Greek culture throughout its history, when we look for its presence or influence in Greek literature, it is not always easy to find. One conspicuous exception to this rule is comedy, where philosophers and their ideas are regular targets of the poets' barbs, and another is epigram. Why this is so is not so obvious. It depends in a general way on the intellectual sophistication of the best epigrammatists and their audiences, but its specific source can be found in the sympotic setting of many epigrams. The symposium's rules of engagement provided an opportunity for both philosophical discussion, on the model of Plato's *Symposium*, and the exchange of apparently extemporaneous verse which was often satirical in tone. Epigrams on philosophers, which tend to be critical if not scurrilous, combine these two activities typical of symposia and can be understood as a concise expression of their social context whether the sympotic setting is viewed as a literary construct or the historical occasion of a poem's composition and performance.¹ Below we survey the various ways in which philosophers, their technical language and their ideas are treated in the genre.

1. *Epitaphs*

Philosophers appear in a variety of epigram types including the most traditional, the epitaph.² These assume a variety of forms. For example, a series on Diogenes the Cynic includes the conversation of a passerby with an element on the monument (Anon. *AP* 7.64), an address by

¹ On this controversy see Reitzenstein (1893: 87–104) and Cameron (1995: 76–90) who argue that the sympotic settings of epigrams should be understood literally as the occasion for the composition and performance of epigram, and Giangrande (1968) and Bing (2000) who consider it to be a literary fiction. We will return to the nexus of symposium, philosophy, and epigram in the discussion of Philodemus below.

² See, e.g., Day in this volume.

the monument to passersby (Antipater 77 GP *Garland* = AP 7.65), and admonitions by the deceased himself to Charon, the ferryman of the underworld (Honestus 2 GP *Garland* = AP 7.66; Archias 14 GP *Garland* = AP 7.68). Though several are anonymous and so dateless, probably the earliest is one ascribed to Leonidas of Tarentum whose career began in the second quarter of the third century B.C.:³

Αἶδεω λυπηρὲ διήκονε, τοῦτ' Ἀχέροντος
 ὕδωρ ὃς πλώεις πορθμίδι κυανέη,
 δέξαι μ', εἰ καὶ σοι μέγα βρίθεται ὀκρυόεσσα
 βάρις ἀποφθιμένων, τὸν κύνα Διογένην.
 ὅλπη μοι καὶ πῆρη ἐφόλκια καὶ τὸ παλαιόν
 ἔσθος χῶ φθιμένους ναυστολέων ὀβολός.
 πάνθ' ὅσα κῆν ζωοῖς ἐπεπάμεθα ταῦτα παρ' Ἄϊδαν
 ἔρχομ' ἔχων, λείπω δ' οὐδὲν ὑπ' ἡελίῳ.

Sorrowful servant of Hades, who cross this water
 of Acheron in an ink-blue boat,
 receive me, the dog Diogenes, even if your horrendous barge
 is overloaded with the dead.
 My only accoutrements are a flask and wallet, an ancient
 cloak and an obol, the price of passage for the dead.
 Everything that I acquired in life, I bring
 to Hades. I leave nothing under the sun.

(Leonidas 59 GP = AP 7.67)

Here Leonidas, whose entire *oeuvre*, as we will see below, has a strongly Cynical cast, lists the traditional elements that define Diogenes' legendary poverty and simplicity. So lightly did he travel that there would be room for him even in a fully-laden boat—though how could a boat with such an evanescent cargo be said to weigh anything?—and no material object would be left behind on earth. There is further irony in the image of Diogenes, whose Cynic perspective would have ruled out conventional beliefs about Hades and the afterlife, begging a place in Charon's boat.⁴

Diogenes' accoutrements regularly define the Cynic lifestyle in epigram and quickly become a cliché that Antipater of Thessalonica exploits, for example, when he presents Hipparchia, the wife of Diogenes' pupil Crates and a Cynic in her own right, explaining that she chose the Cynics' wallet, staff, and the cloak which doubled as bedding,

³ On Leonidas' date, see Gow (1958b: 113–7). Gutzwiller (1998b: 88–9) argues that it should be earlier.

⁴ For a discussion of the irony in conventional epitaphs for Cynics see Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 324–5 and n. 137).

over pomaded hairnets and other adornments typical of upper-class women (Antipater (of Sidon) 67 GP = AP 7.413).⁵

2. *Dedications*

Another traditional epigram form recast with philosophical content is the dedication. Leonidas has left us two in which the Cynics' characteristic possessions are hung up as spoils dedicated to mark ironic victories. One is a thank offering for Aphrodite:⁶

Ὅ σκίπων καὶ ταῦτα τὰ βλαυτία, πότνια Κύπρι,
 ἄγκειται κυνικοῦ σκῦλ' ἀπὸ Σωχάρους,
 ὅλη τε ῥυπόεσσα πολυτρήτοιό τε πήρας
 λείψανον, ἀρχαίης πληθόμενον σοφίης·
 σοὶ δὲ Ῥόδων ὁ καλός, τὸν πάνσοφον ἥνικα πρέσβυν
 ἤγρευσεν, στεπτοῖς θήκατ' ἐπὶ προθύροις.

The staff and these slippers, queen Cypris,
 are dedicated as spoils from the Cynic Sochares.
 His filthy oil flask and the remains of his perforated wallet,
 filled with ancient wisdom,
 handsome Rhodon dedicated to you on this ornamented porch
 when he bagged that very wise old man.

(Leonidas 54 GP = AP 6.293)

Though Sochares' staff, oil flask and the wallet itself are in the Cynic mode, the slippers he was wearing belong in the world of dinner parties and suggest that this is where Sochares was persuaded by Rhodon, an archetypal *eromenos* whose name means rose (ῥόδον), to abandon his philosophical values and the other contents of his wallet. Rhodon, like a conqueror in battle, stripped his victim of his armor and dedicated it to an appropriate deity.

There is an implicit contrast here with the magisterial figure of Socrates who wears the same slippers to the dinner party described in Plato's *Symposium* (174a). Unlike Socrates, the perennial *erastes* who nevertheless maintains his self-control in the face of Alcibiades' attempted seduction (218c–219e), Sochares yields to Rhodon and is revealed to be no philosopher at all.

⁵ The poem might equally be by Antipater of Sidon. For confusions between the two see Argentieri (2003).

⁶ In the other, the triumph is celebrated by "Starvation" (Leonidas 55 GP = AP 6.298).

3. *Ad hominem attacks*

These epigrams of Leonidas offer a decidedly ironical, even satirical, treatment of philosophers which is common throughout the history of the genre. Cynics are often targets, as above and in epigrams of Antipater of Thessalonica (97 *GP Garland* = *AP* 11.158) and Lucilius (*AP* 11.153), but epigrammatists cast their nets widely. Theocritus of Chios, e.g., has this to say about Aristotle:

Ἑρμίου εὐνούχου τε καὶ Εὐβούλου τόδε δούλου⁷
 σῆμα κενὸν κενόφρων τεῦξεν Ἀριστοτέλης,
 ὃς γαστρός τιμῶν ἄνομον φύσιν εἴλετο ναίειν
 ἀντ' Ἀκαδημείας βορβόρου ἐν προχοαῖς.

Empty-headed Aristotle built this empty tomb
 for Hermias, a eunuch and slave of Eubulus.
 He honored the lawless nature of his belly when he chose to live
 by that outpouring of filth instead of the Academy.

(Theocritus of Chios 1 *FGE* = Aristocles *ap.* Eusebius
Praep. ev. 15.2)

Behind this epigram is a story told by Diogenes Laertius about Hermias, the tyrant of Atarneus who brought together a group of Plato's students at Assos including Aristotle who had left the Academy in Athens shortly before Plato's death.⁸ When the Persian king Artaxerxes killed Hermias a few years later, Aristotle built a cenotaph for him at Delphi and praised him in an epigram (Aristotle 1 *FGE*) and a poem known as the "Hymn to Virtue" (D. L. 5.6–8 = 842 *PMG*).

Theocritus borrowed the claim that Hermias was a eunuch and slave from a letter the historian Theopompus of Chios wrote to Philip of Macedon in an earlier effort to discredit Hermias,⁹ and there is no reason to believe that it was true. In both authors the insult is part of a wider assault that includes charges of gluttony, sexual perversion, and the inexplicable choice of residence in a barbarian state over civilized life in Athens. For Theocritus, hatred of Aristotle is an expression of

⁷ My thanks to Peter Bing for the observation that the unusual assonance of the first verse, which contains seven repeated –ou sounds amplified with two –ευ diphthongs, seems to express Aristotle's oafish nature.

⁸ See Page (1981: 94–5); Wormell (1935: 58) and Owen (1983: 4–11). Aristotle's epigram and Hymn were apparently the basis for a charge of impiety brought against him in Athens.

⁹ Theopompus himself found the terms in Herodotus 8.105 where they apply to a certain Hermodotus of Atarneus, another person altogether (Wormell 1935: 73).

his strongly anti-Macedonian views,¹⁰ summed up by the paradox that the world's most learned philosopher, who built an empty tomb, is himself "empty-headed."

Beyond the simple insults Runia notes an allusion in the last verse to Plato *Rep.* 533c–d where the "eye of soul" is mired in barbaric filth (ἐν βορβόρῳ βαρβαρικῷ) and can be rescued only by dialectic. Theocritus' point here, he suggests, is to attack Aristotle "on his own terms," by making explicit, in the language of Aristotle's teacher, the contrast between his actions and his moral pontificating.¹¹

This epigram is also quoted by Diogenes Laertius in his life of Aristotle (5.11) where it is followed immediately by a fragment of a verse in the same spirit from the *Silloi* of Timon of Phlius:

οὐδ' ἄρ' Ἀριστοτέλους εἰκαιοσύνης ἀλεγεινῆς

nor the painful conjecturing of Aristotle.

(SH 810 = 36 Diels)

Timon here references *Il.* 23.701 where Achilles sets up prizes for "painful wrestling." In the *Silloi* philosophers contest with arguments, not blows. The *Silloi* present themselves as a first hand account of Timon's journey through the underworld where he "sees" philosophers from all periods of Greek history, including his own, whom he insults in clever ways that show a wide knowledge of the field. The setting and organization are borrowed from book 11 of the *Odyssey* where Odysseus is in Hades searching for the dead seer Tiresias and in the process observes and sometimes converses with various shades of the dead including some of the heroes who fought with him at Troy. In Timon's underworld it is philosophers who battle it out in the language and style of Homer, so "painful wrestling" easily becomes "painful conjecturing." Although there is some evidence in the *Silloi* of large-scale philosophical battle scenes, Timon usually pillories his targets in Homeric and Hesiodic-style catalogues in which he strings together satiric quips roughly the size and shape of an epigram. This fragment on Aristotle is a piece of one of those catalogues.

Diogenes' coupling of Timon's quip on Aristotle and the invective of Theocritus of Chios suggests that he saw a connection or at least

¹⁰ Reviews of the evidence are in Franco (1991) and Wormell (1935).

¹¹ Runia (1986: 532–3). Plutarch, who missed Theocritus' meaning, thought that Borborus was a river near Pella in Macedonia (*Mor.* 603c).

common ground between the *Silloi* and philosophical epigram, and this is made explicit by the appearance of Timon's witty couplet on Dionysius of Heracleia in the tenth book of the *AP*:

ἡνίκ' ἐχρῆν δύνειν, νῦν ἄρχεται ἡδύνεσθαι·
ὥρῃ ἐρᾶν, ὥρῃ δὲ γαμεῖν, ὥρῃ δὲ πέπανσθαι.

When it was necessary to retire, now he begins to seek pleasure.

There is a time to love, a time to marry and a time to stop.

(*SH* 791 = *AP* 10.38 = Athen. 7.281e)

Dionysius of Heracleia was a Stoic famous for deserting his ascetic school in old age and going over to the Epicureans (Athen. 7.281d–e). The second line parodies *Odyssey* 11.379, and Timon's adaptation of it takes its place in the *GA* as a stand-alone epigram attributed to a certain Dionysius (*AP* 10.38). This, of course, is the same name as Timon's target and it seems that Cephalus or his source misunderstood the name of the subject as the name of the author. This is understandable because there were other epigrammatists named Dionysius, but Timon was not in this company. He was a student of the first Skeptical philosopher, Pyrrho of Elis, as well as a poet who wrote tragedies, comedies, hexameters and elegiacs. In short, he was a genuine philosopher and a versatile poet. Among the authors of philosophical epigrams only Philodemus, whom we will discuss below, has equivalent credentials.

Just like Leonidas, who was his close contemporary, Timon skewers his victims by exposing their moral shortcomings. This is what he has to say about Epicurus, for example:

γαστρὶ χαριζόμενος τῆς οὐ λαμυρώτερον οὐδέν

gratifying his stomach, than which nothing was greedier.

(*SH* 781 = 7 Diels¹²)

The portrayal of Epicurus as a debauched gourmand is a distortion of the Epicurean doctrine of qualified hedonism which took shape during Epicurus' lifetime. He complains about this slander himself in his *Letter to Menoeceus* and it was already a cliché in third century comedy.¹³

Like the epigrammatists, Timon emphasizes the emptiness of philosophical arguments. His Menedemus "roars with stupidities" (*SH* 803 =

¹² Diels (1901).

¹³ Sedley (1976: 129–32) traces it to a deliberate smear campaign by Timocrates, the brother of Epicurus' friend and disciple, Metrodorus.

29 Diels); Antisthenes is a “babbler” (*SH* 811 = 37 Diels); Empedocles, a “barker” (*SH* 816 = 42 Diels); and Heraclitus crows like a cock (*SH* 817 = 43 Diels). His Skeptical rejection of all philosophers and philosophies often betrays a detailed knowledge of their thought. This, for example, is his treatment of Empedocles:

καὶ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ἀγοραίων
ληκητῆς ἐπέων· ὅσα δ' ἔσθενε τόσσα διεῖλεν
ἀρχῶν ὡς διέθηκ' ἀρχὰς ἐπιδευέας ἄλλων.

and Empedocles, shouter of
words suitable for the agora; whatever he could, these he separated off.
Thus he set out for sale first principles needing other first principles.

(*SH* 816 = 42 Diels)

Empedocles is here hawking his physics in the marketplace where anyone could come and buy them. His first principles are four elements: earth, air, fire and water, which change only when they are acted on by two additional entities, Love and Strife. Thus, the first principles need other first principles. Timon could have found out this much about Empedocles from Aristotle (*Met.* 985a–b) who also complains that Empedocles is “inarticulate.” From here it is only one small imaginative step to turn Empedocles into the philosophical equivalent of a fishmonger.¹⁴

Timon's *Silloi*, which lampoons all philosophers and philosophies, is an expression of the Skeptical view which rejects any possibility of knowledge. Though Timon's motives were not necessarily shared by any of the epigrammatists, his philosophical sophistication, and in particular a comparable brevity and wit, can be found again and again in their work.

4. *A poet who knows philosophy*

Callimachus of Cyrene, that towering figure in Hellenistic poetry, was as well versed as any in the Greek philosophical tradition and Timon himself may have been a target of one of his epigrams:

¹⁴ ἀγοραίων...ἐπέων is language of the marketplace; ληκητῆς, a barker; and διέθηκε denotes commercial distribution.

Τίμων, οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἐσσί, τί τοι, σκότος ἢ φάος, ἐχθρόν;
 – τὸ σκότος, ὑμέων γὰρ πλείονες εἰν Αἴδη.

Timon (for you are no more), which is more hateful to you, darkness or light?

“The darkness, for there are more of you in Hades.”

(Callimachus 51 GP = AP 7.317)¹⁵

It is usually assumed that this poem is addressed to Timon the misanthrope, a colorful figure from fifth century Athens who is a frequent subject of epigram,¹⁶ but a critical Timon who jokes from the underworld about his own negative attitudes suggests Timon of Phlius.¹⁷ Sepulchral epigrams often feature brief conversations between a passer-by and the deceased, but like the location of this conversation in the underworld, its format is especially suited to Timon of Phlius whose *Silloi* are organized as a series of questions to reflect the identity of *skepsis* with inquiry. Callimachus would certainly have outlived Timon, though the mock epitaph for someone still alive was not uncommon. Callimachus wrote one for himself (30 GP = AP 7.415), and Timon composed a mock *Funeral Banquet* for the Academic philosopher Arce-silaus (D. L. 9.115).

Like the third book of Timon's *Silloi*, Callimachus' epigrams focus on more recent philosophers. One from which we have a substantial fragment is on Diodorus Cronus, one of the so-called the *Dialektikoi*.¹⁸ Timon characterizes him as “convoluted” (*SH* 806 = 32 Diels), recalling his interests in puzzles and logic. It also suits his nickname if it refers to Homer's “crooked-counseling Cronus.”¹⁹

αὐτὸς ὁ Μῶμος
 ἔγραφεν ἐν τοίχοις, ‘ὁ Κρόνος ἐστὶ σοφός.’
 ἦνιδε κοῖ κόρακες τεγέων ἔπι ‘Κοῖα συνηπται;
 κρώζουσιν καὶ ‘Κῶς αὐθι γενησόμεθα;’²⁰

¹⁵ A second epigram follows, apparently also an epitaph for Timon, but it does not identify him by name (Callimachus 52 GP = AP 7.318).

¹⁶ See AP 7.313–20 and the discussion in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 302–6).

¹⁷ White (1994: 145–6).

¹⁸ Sedley (1977: 74–7).

¹⁹ Hicks (1962: 320, n. 2).

²⁰ The first two verses are quoted in D. L. 2.111, the second two in S. E. M. 1.309 and they were put together by Bentley who assumed that there was a lacuna between them, Gow-Page (1965: 2.215). They may also be out of order or come from separate epigrams. The text here is Pfeiffer's.

Blame himself
wrote on the walls, "Cronus is wise."
Look how the crows on the roof caw, "What things are conjoined?"
and "How will we be again?"

(Callimachus 64 GP = fr. 393 Pf.)

Like the *Silloi*, this epigram has a cutting edge. The writer of the apparently admiring graffito, "Cronus is wise," is Momus, "Blame" personified. Blame's praise must be ironic because how else could Blame praise? A crooked-counselor, like Cronus, cannot be wise, but if his arguments, like Diodorus', are impenetrable, he might seem so.²¹

The crows on the roof mimic Diodorus' Ionic accent²² and repeat catch-phrases that point to some of his intellectual interests. The first question refers to Diodorus' interest in the logic of hypotheticals. Sextus says that "Cronus was a great dialectician and taught how to judge the validity of conditional propositions, so that because of the dominance of his teaching even the ravens on the housetops were, from constantly hearing it, crowing his criterion for conditional propositions" (S. E. M. 1.310).²³ Sextus goes on to explain that the second question refers to Diodorus' theory of motion: nothing moves so nothing perishes, and therefore we are all immortal (S. E. M. 1.311–2). Putting these arguments in the mouth of crows, who repeat things without comprehending them, suggests that people were dazzled by Diodorus' teaching, but did not understand how foolish it was.

Callimachus also wrote an epigram on Cleombrotus, probably the student of Socrates and associate of Aristippus (Plato, *Phaed.* 59c):

Εἵπας, Ἥλιε χαῖρε, Κλεόμβροτος ὠμβρακίωτης
ἦλαθ' ἀφ' ὑψηλοῦ τείχεος εἰς Αἶδην,
ἄξιον οὐδὲν ἰδὼν θανάτου κακὸν ἀλλὰ Πλάτωνος
ἐν τὸ περὶ ψυχῆς γράμμ' ἀναλεξάμενος.

²¹ Cronus can also mean "old codger," because he was older than even Zeus, or "Blockhead" (D. L. 2.111; Strabo 14.658), and if this is Callimachus' meaning, Momus is saying that Diodorus has only a Blockhead's wisdom. Either way, it is not a compliment.

²² Diodorus was from the Carian island of Iasus. Κοῖα and κῶς are Ionic forms that would be used by the inhabitants there, Blank (1998: 341). Consonantly, von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1906: 173, n. 1) emended the MS's κου to κοι = καὶ οἱ or χοῖ: "Kallimachos hat mit Bedacht die ionische Psilosis aufgenommen," doing so "um des Klanges willen." The repeated "k" sounds imitate the cawing of crows and insinuate that the Ionians and Diodorus are no more intelligent than the birds.

²³ The translation is Blank's (1998: 64).

Saying, "Farewell, Sun," Cleombrotus of Ambracia
 leapt from a high wall into Hades;
 he saw no evil worthy of death, but had read
 one work of Plato, *On the Soul*.

(Callimachus 53 GP = AP 7.471)²⁴

On the Soul is Plato's *Phaedo*,²⁵ which presents Socrates' deathbed discussion of the soul's immortality. Though the *Phaedo* raises expectations of the benefits philosophers enjoy after death when their soul separates from their bodies, it explicitly warns against suicide (61c) and Cleombrotus clearly had not read it correctly. This epigram underscores both the power of Plato's prose, the limits of Cleombrotus' understanding, and the irrationality of trying to apply Plato's radical ideas to real life.²⁶

5. *Philosophy as an aesthetic orientation*

In another important epigram Callimachus presents Pittacus of Mytilene, one of the Seven Wise Men, who is asked by a stranger from Atarneus whether he should marry a woman who is his social and economic equal, or someone above his station. This was the response:

εἶπεν· ὁ δὲ σκίπωνα γεροντικὸν ὄπλον αἰείρας·
 ἥνιδε κείνοί σοι πᾶν ἐρέουσιν ἔπος,
 (οἱ δ' ἄρ' ὑπὸ πληγῇσι θοὰς βέμβικας ἔχοντες
 ἔστρεφον εὐρείῃ παῖδες ἐνὶ τριόδῳ.)
 'κείνων ἔρχεο,' φησί, 'μετ' ἔχνια.' χῶ μὲν ἐπέστη
 πλησίον, οἱ δ' ἔλεγον 'τὴν κατὰ σαυτὸν ἔλα.'

He spoke. And Pittacus raised his staff, the old man's weapon,
 "See there! These will tell you the whole tale."

These were boys who were spinning their swift tops with blows
 at a wide crossroad.

"Follow their tracks," he said, and the stranger stood near.

They said, "Drive along your own [path]!"

(Callimachus 54.7–12 GP = AP 7.89.7–12)

²⁴ A detailed study of this poem is in White (1994), and see also Gutzwiller (1998b: 205–6).

²⁵ περὶ ψυχῆς was an alternative title for the *Phaedo* (Plat. *Epist.* 13.363 and P.Oxy. 2087.22). See Gow-Page (1965: 2.204–5).

²⁶ On Callimachus' target, see Riginos (1976: 181) and White (1994: 136), who also evaluates other interpretations of the epigram.

When the stranger heard that, he gave up the prospect of wealth and married the bride who was his equal (13–15). The poem concludes by offering the same puzzling advice to the reader in general (16) or to an addressee named Dion.²⁷

Like the Skeptic Pyrrho, whom Timon assimilates to the tradition of the Seven Sages, Pittacus performs his wisdom by indirection. As in Timon's *Indalmi* and the *Silloi*, a question is posed to the teacher and the answer is anything but straightforward. Rather than speaking, Pittacus points his stick at some children at play and suggests that their words should be taken as clues which the inquirer may interpret as a kind of oracle. And just as if it really were an oracular response, τὴν κατὰ σαυτὸν ἔλα can mean a number of different things because the noun associated with the definite article, τήν, is swallowed in an ellipse. Are the boys saying "drive your own top" (τὴν βέμβικαν) or "keep your top on its own path" (τὴν ὁδόν, Gow-Page (1965: 2.206))? The stranger assimilates the phrase to his own situation and gives the words a third meaning, "keep to your own social level," which appears to be what Pittacus intended although we can never be sure. Finally, Callimachus' readers, who are invited to apply the phrase to their own lives, would understand it each in their own way, creating a multitude of additional meanings.

Gutzwiller has argued persuasively that this was the first poem in his collected epigrams and functioned as an "imagistic illustration of Callimachus' philosophy of life and poetry."²⁸ Callimachus' poetic program, clearly set out in the prologue to his *Aitia* and elsewhere, aims at a "slender style" characterized by purity, lightness and exquisite workmanship. In addition to these general values, the "poor bride" represents the genre of epigram—its natural modesty, brevity and restraint, which Pittacus recommends over a more ambitious alternative. Callimachus' couching of his poetic program and choice of genre as the wisdom of a proto-philosopher from another age illustrates the particularly subtle way in which philosophy informs his art. The ambiguity and indirection of Pittacus' response embodied in the half-heard

²⁷ Dion appears in D. L.'s text, adopted by GP, where the final verse begins, οὕτω καὶ σύ, Δίων. The *AP* and *AP^L* read σύ γ' ἴων which eliminates him. For discussion, Gow-Page (1965: 2.207).

²⁸ Gutzwiller (1998b: 226). On the poem's presentation of Callimachean aesthetics, Livrea (1995).

words of children at play which can be assigned multiple meanings by different interpreters both inside and outside the narrative framework of the poem point to a perspective on the nature of things associated with the Skepticism of Pyrrho, whom Timon portrayed as a sage in the tradition of the canonical Seven, and whose modest, unconventional, and chaotic lifestyle expressed a world-view in which all things were equally undifferentiated, unstable, and indeterminate.²⁹

When Callimachus positions his epigrams as the wisdom of a traditional sage, he may be responding to his older contemporary Asclepiades who locates his through an allusion to contemporary Epicurean thought:

Ἡδὺ θέρουσι διψῶντι χιὼν ποτόν, ἡδὺ δέ ναύταις
ἐκ χειμῶνος ἰδεῖν εἰαρινὸν Στέφανον·
ἡδὺ δ' ὅποταν κρύψει μία τοὺς φιλέοντας
χλαῖνα, καὶ αἰνῆται Κύπρις ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων.

Sweet to the thirsty is a cold drink in summer, and to sailors
it is sweet to see the spring Crown after winter;
but this is sweeter: whenever one cloak hides lovers
and Aphrodite is honored by both.

(Asclepiades 1 GP = AP 5.169)

Asclepiades' focus on sweetness (ἡδύ... ἡδύ... ἡδὺον) points to the philosophy of Epicurus which argues that pleasure (ἡδονή) is the highest good.³⁰ The first of Asclepiades' pleasures, a cold drink to the thirsty, is an example of Epicurus' first category, physical pleasures created by removing pain; and the second, the first sign of spring to sailors after a winter marooned on shore refers to Epicurus' categories of mental pleasures.³¹ Asclepiades' third and best pleasure, the mutual satisfaction of two lovers, seems like a rejection of Epicurus' teaching that sexual passion should be avoided because of its potential to create pain, but the poet's choice of terms for the lovers, φιλέοντες, recalls the value Epicurus put on friendship (φιλία), and the lovers' mutuality together with the presentation of their actions as a religious rite, "doing honor to Aphrodite," seems to bring even the subject of passion, a frequent

²⁹ Pyrrho's characterization of reality is summarized in the so-called Aristocles fragment (in Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica* 14.18.2–5 = fr. 4 Chiesara).

³⁰ Gutzwiller (1998b: 128–30) notes that in addition to the Epicurean allusion, ἡδὺ looks to the first epigram of Anyte (*API* 228 = 18.2 GP).

³¹ Gutzwiller (1998b: 129). She reads χειμῶνος as a storm through which the sailors have safely come (128). The interpretation above is that of Gow-Page (1965: 2.118).

topic in Asclepiades' extant work, within the context of contemporary philosophy.

Asclepiades' younger contemporary, Posidippus, responds to this poem in the introduction to one of his own epigram collections by banishing philosophy altogether, in this case, Stoicism.

Κεκροπί, ῥαῖνε, λάγυνε, πολύδροσον ἱκμάδα Βάκχου,
 ῥαῖνε· δροσιζέσθω συμβολικὴ πρόποσις·
 σιγάσθω Ζήνων, ὁ σοφὸς κύκνος, ὃ τε Κλεάνθους
 Μοῦσα, μέλοι δ' ἡμῖν ὁ γλυκύπικρος Ἔρως.

Wine jar of Cecrops, drizzle the dewy moisture of Bacchus,
 drizzle it. And may this symbolic toast drench us.
 Let Zeno, the wise swan, be silent, and the Muse of Cleanthes,
 and let bittersweet Eros be our concern.

(Posidippus 1 GP = AP 5.134 = 123 AB)

This rejection of Zeno, the founding head of the Stoic school and his successor, Cleanthes, led Schott to conclude that Posidippus had been a student of Zeno's in Athens,³² but it is better to understand it with Gutzwiller as an introductory poem that responds to Asclepiades' (just above).³³ Unlike Asclepiades who accommodates himself to Epicurean values, Posidippus positions his work in opposition to Zeno, who was proverbially sober (D. L. 7.27), and presents his poetic persona as someone who will be inspired by wine to sing, unstoically, of love. Unlike Asclepiades whose Epicurean lovers experience love's sweetest pleasure, Posidippus' Eros will be bittersweet.

6. *The poet as a philosopher*

Callimachus, Asclepiades and Posidippus, then, rely on their reader's familiarity with major currents in Greek philosophy to position their epigrams in the Hellenistic intellectual landscape. None is a philosopher, though we saw above that Callimachus' knowledge of Greek philosophy ranges across all periods. In contrast with these poets for whom philosophical concepts and language are part of a wider cultural perspective, a large number of the Tarentine Leonidas' epigrams appear to have a consistently Cynical perspective which suggests a deeper

³² Schott (1905: 44–6).

³³ Gutzwiller (1998b: 157–9).

commitment to philosophical ideals.³⁴ One expression of this can be found in his epigrams against the corrupt Cynic Sochares which we examined above. It is not the Cynics' ideals that Leonidas lampoons there, but an individual who does not live up to them. That Sochares is starved by the austerity of his Cynic lifestyle (Leonidas 55 GP = AP 6.298) only shows that he did not approach it correctly.³⁵

Leonidas' Cynicism is largely reflected in his many poems featuring individuals who live in dignified poverty at the lower levels of the social scale, including fishermen (20 GP = AP 7.295), weavers (72 GP = AP 7.726), and carpenters (7 GP = AP 6.204) who make modest dedications of the tools of their crafts or are given dignified epitaphs. In other poems, material wealth is shown to be ultimately worthless as, for example, Crethon's many possessions which are reduced in death to the real estate occupied by his tomb (75 GP = AP 7.740).

Sentiments like these are associated with Cynic diatribes, a kind of popular moralizing literature, generally in prose or a mixture of prose and poetry, which may have been influenced by the harangues of street philosophers and seem to reproduce them in a literary form.³⁶ The diatribes of Bion of Borysthenes and his follower Teles, e.g., treat many of the same themes as Leonidas' epigrams, and it has been noted that an epigram of Leonidas' on the easy road to death (79 GP) is a restatement of a saying of Bion's (D. L. 4.49).³⁷ The attitudes and opinions associated with diatribes also appear in Hellenistic poetry, notably in the work of Phoenix of Colophon and Cercidas who both wrote in choliambics,³⁸ and even finds its way into the *Iambi* of Callimachus.³⁹

Leonidas approaches diatribe most closely in this strange piece:

Oh sir, great was the time before you came into the
light, and great is the remaining time in Hades.
What portion of life is left than just a moment,
and whatever is less than a moment?

³⁴ Leonidas' Cynicism is discussed at length by Gigante (1971: 45–55) who credits the idea to Geffcken (1896: 138). See also Gutzwiller (1998b: 102–4).

³⁵ N.B. Cercidas' comparable critique of *some* Stoics who lead boys astray, in contrast to the good example of Zeno (fr. 6 Livrea, esp. 6b.8–9).

³⁶ On the Greek diatribe see Oltamare (1926).

³⁷ Fr. 66 Kinstrand and (1976: 279).

³⁸ Text and commentary for Phoenix in Gerhard (1909) and for Cercidas, Livrea (1986).

³⁹ Clayman (1980: 66–71).

Your short life is afflicted, not sweet,
 but gloomier than hateful death.
 Humans, fitted together from such a union of bones,
 raise themselves up to the air and clouds.
 Sir, see how useless it is since at the end of life's thread
 a moth, sitting on your loosely-woven flesh,
 makes it like a stripped fig leaf, like
 something more hateful than a mummified spider.
 Day by day, sir, noting the extent of your strength,
 may you support yourself in a simple life,
 always mindful of this, as long as you live,
 from what bits of straw you are pieced together.
 (Leonidas 77 GP = AP 7.472)

This almost Buddhist contemplation of death belongs to the world of epitaph, but is too long to pretend that it was engraved on any tombstone. Some scholars have suggested breaking it into shorter pieces,⁴⁰ but this seems unnecessary because no hard and fast rules of length or content separate epigram from elegy.⁴¹ Callimachus' epigram on Pittacus, quoted only partially above, is exactly the same length and like it, Leonidas' diatribe on death was included by Cephalus in his anthology.

While Callimachus' poem on Pittacus is a teaching story, a *chreia*, which makes its point by indirection, Leonidas' reads more like a set of instructions which suits the diatribe tradition. Callimachus invokes his philosopher, as we noted above, to make a literary point, but the persona Leonidas constructs for himself in his epigrams makes it easy to believe that he was personally committed to Cynicism at some level. His "wandering life which is no life" (93 GP = AP 7.715) and his advice to some mice to leave his house because his resources are so few (37 GP = AP 6.302) seem to bring the poet into the world of his impoverished, but noble subjects.

Yet it is unlikely that Leonidas' carefully constructed poetic persona had much to do with the circumstances of his own life.⁴² Among Hellenistic poets poverty is virtually a leitmotif. Callimachus, e.g., complains bitterly about it in his *Iambi*, where his starving Muses are reduced to

⁴⁰ Review of suggested divisions in Gow-Page (1965: 2.379–80).

⁴¹ On the relation between epigram and elegy, Parsons (2002: 128–30), Gentili (1968) and Puelma (1997).

⁴² Radice (1965).

eating green figs (fr. 191.92–3 Pf.), though he enjoyed the patronage of Ptolemy Philadelphus and the amenities of the Alexandrian Museum. For Callimachus, poverty is synonymous with the modesty and restraint that are key concepts in his literary program, and this suits the style and subject matter of Leonidas whose interest in the lives of ordinary people is part of a much wider trend in Hellenistic literature evident in Theocritus' goatherds, Herodas' gossiping housewives, and the destitution of Callimachus' heroine, Hecale.⁴³ An overlay of Cynic moralizing may be Leonidas' own contribution to the development of this theme and the more graphic elements of his "diatribe on death" have a baroque quality worthy of the age.

In any case, Leonidas' Cynicism has none of the humor and freshness of Diogenes himself, and none of his zest for overstepping social boundaries. Like Leonidas' persona, Diogenes was a wanderer and a poor man, but his life was a rhetorical stance—a living *chreia*—which challenged individuals to recognize their own limitations.⁴⁴ Leonidas, in contrast, confines himself within very narrow limits and uses the language and imagery of Cynicism to take an aesthetic stance.

Leonidas' derivative Cynicism can be compared with Timon's exuberant and authentic Skepticism. His *Silloi* are clearly and uniformly a version of Skeptical argument, i.e., a demonstration that all argument is useless and all philosophers corrupt, which has much in common with the parodies of Diogenes' student Crates of Thebes and the satires of Menippus of Gadara.

7. *The philosopher as an epigrammatist*

Unlike Leonidas, who, as far as we know, never studied philosophy or claimed to be a philosopher, Timon was a student of Pyrrho of Elis, the first Skeptic philosopher, and wrote technical treatises with titles like *On Sense Perceptions* (D. L. 9.105) and *Against the Physicists* (S. E. M. 3.2). The only epigrammatist with equivalent philosophical credentials is Philodemus of Gadara, who studied in Athens with the Epicurean Zeno of Sidon before emigrating to Italy in about 70 B.C. where he

⁴³ On the lives of ordinary people in Hellenistic literature and art, see Fowler (1989).

⁴⁴ On the rhetoric of Diogenes' life, Branham (1993).

joined a circle of Roman aristocrats with Epicurean sympathies and poets like Virgil and Horace.⁴⁵

Philodemus is the author of 30 or more epigrams collected in the *Garland of Philip*,⁴⁶ many of them frankly erotic. In Philodemus 11 GP *Garland* (= AP 5.131 = 1 Sider), e.g., the narrator's soul is about to be set on fire by the music of Xanthippe. In 2 GP *Garland* (= AP 5.13 = 9 Sider) the author extols the charms of a 60-year-old prostitute and 12 GP *Garland* (= AP 5.132 = 12 Sider) is a description of a desirable woman, feature by feature, starting with her feet and moving upwards. He addresses a young girl whom he loves in 10 GP *Garland* (= AP 5.124 = 16 Sider) and laments the impotence that accompanies old age in 27 GP *Garland* (= AP 11.30 = 19 Sider).

These are not the themes we would expect from an Epicurean poet whose school favored pleasures of a more refined sort.⁴⁷ In fact, we would not expect an Epicurean to be a poet at all given Epicurus' own rejection of poetry's role in education and his insistence that a wise man would not compose any. Philodemus, however, was no ordinary Epicurean. Though Epicurus dismissed traditional learning because it was useless and unnecessary for happiness, Philodemus was an intellectual who wrote on the history of philosophy, scientific method, theology, ethics, household management, rhetoric, music and poetry.⁴⁸ In his treatises *On Poems* and *On Music* he systematically explores the nature and value of poetry. Here he agrees with Epicurus that poetry has no educational value, but argues instead for its capacity to provide pleasure, the central Epicurean value. *On Music* reveals a wide knowledge of Greek poetry. And though Philodemus agrees that love songs are more likely to inflame passion than quench it, he argues that music, joined with the right words, can be relaxing and is especially appropriate at social gatherings.⁴⁹

Epigram, by nature a modest genre suited to a sympotic setting, would seem, then, to be a genre appropriate to an Epicurean lifestyle where great value was put on social events as a source of pleasure for

⁴⁵ On Philodemus and the recovery of his library, Gigante (1995). It is not certain that Philodemus knew Horace.

⁴⁶ Sider (1997: 33) accepts 36 as genuine, Gigante (2002: XXXIII), 42.

⁴⁷ This discrepancy led Gigante (2002: XXXII–XXXVIII) to conclude that a number of Philodemus' epigrams were written before he left Gadara and fell under the influence of the Epicureans.

⁴⁸ On the prose works of Philodemus, Asmis (1990).

⁴⁹ Asmis (1990: 2403) and (1995) and Janko (2000: 9, n. 2 with bibliography).

the participants and as occasions to commemorate the founder. One of Philodemus' poems is an invitation to his patron L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus to attend a quintessential Epicurean feast:

αὔριον εἰς λιτὴν σε καλιάδα, φίλτατε Πείσων,
 ἐξ ἐνάτης ἔλκει μουσοφιλῆς ἕταρος
 εἰκάδα δειπνίζων ἐνιαύσιον. εἰ δ' ἀπολείψεις
 οὐθата καὶ Βρομίου Χιογενῇ πρόποσιν,
 ἀλλ' ἐτάρους ὅψει παναληθέας, ἀλλ' ἐπακούσῃ
 Φαίηκων γαίης πούλῳ μελιχρότερα.
 ἦν δέ ποτε στρέψῃς καὶ ἐς ἡμέας ὄμματα, Πείσων,
 ἄξομεν ἐκ λιτῆς εἰκάδα πιστότερην.⁵⁰

Tomorrow at three, dear Piso, your Muse-loving comrade
 will take you to his simple shack,
 entertaining you on the occasion of the annual Twentieth. If you will
 do without delicacies and a toast with Chian wine,
 you will see the truest friends, and you will hear
 things much sweeter than they did in the land of the Phaeacians.
 If ever you turn your eyes to us, Piso,
 we will hold a richer Twentieth than our modest one.
 (Philodemus 23 GP *Garland* = *AP* 11.44 = 27 Sider)

Here Philodemus is inviting his patron Piso to a modest feast in a simple setting without delicacies like stuffed cow's udders and expensive wine, offering instead true camaraderie and something sweeter to hear than the song Demodocus sang about the war at Troy when the Phaeacians entertained the ship-wrecked Odysseus in book 8 of the *Odyssey*. This is both a suggestion that the entertainment to be offered at Philodemus' dinner will be superior to Homeric poetry and a reference to *Od.* 9.5–11, a famous passage in which Odysseus declares to the Phaeacians that there is no greater joy than banqueting and music. There is reason to believe that Epicurus himself cited this passage as part of an argument that the highest good in life is pleasure, and this suggests in turn that the master's own view of music is more nuanced than some of our sources suggest.⁵¹ The epithet Philodemus assigns to himself, "muse-loving" or equally, "loved by the Muses," suggests that Piso will be treated to a recitation of his host's own epigrams and that the pleasure of this experience is appropriately Epicurean.

⁵⁰ The text of this and all epigrams of Philodemus cited in this chapter follow Sider (1997).

⁵¹ See Asmis (1995) for a detailed discussion of all the evidence and its implications.

The occasion for Philodemus' invitation is the "Twentieth," an event celebrated in the Epicurean community on the twentieth of each month with dedications to the founder and his family.⁵² Invitations to Epicurean dinners have turned up in the papyrus fragments of Philodemus, including one issued by Epicurus himself,⁵³ and this poem is a versified version of this typically Epicurean social form.

Although Philodemus appears in the opening verses to embrace Epicurean simplicity, in the last two he hints broadly to Piso that if he increases his financial support, more lavish celebrations will follow. This seems to be a turning away from Epicurean values, but in his treatise *On Household Management* Philodemus justifies the acquisition of modest wealth as a way of providing for natural, if unnecessary, desires, and argues that the highest form of livelihood is to be paid for sharing philosophical discourses with others (P. Herc. 1424, col. 23.22–36).⁵⁴ It seems likely, then, that philosophy will be among the sweet things Piso will hear at dinner. Plato put philosophy squarely in the Muses' domain and the *De Rerum Natura* of Philodemus' contemporary Lucretius is both an important poem and an exposition of Epicurean philosophy. While Philodemus' own poetry is hardly didactic, the dinner Piso is invited to attend is in the sympotic tradition joining poetry and philosophy.

Other symposia evoked in his epigrams are not Epicurean rituals at all, but more like the riotous occasions at which Posidippus would be at home. In his treatment of them, Philodemus creates a tension between two personae, the hard-living, hard-drinking, passionate poet and the self-controlled philosopher who limits himself to discrete Epicurean pleasures.

In one, the poet calls on the Muses to help him adopt a suitable lifestyle:

ἐπὶ τὰ τριηκόντεσσιν ἐπέρχονται λυκάβαντες,
 ἤδη μοι βιότου σχιζόμεναι σελίδες·
 ἤδη καὶ λευκαὶ με κατασπείρουσιν ἔθειραι,
 Ξανθίππη, συνετῆς ἄγγελοι ἡλικίης,
 ἀλλ' ἔτι μοι ψαλμός τε λάλος κῶμοί τε μέλονται
 καὶ πῦρ ἀπλήστῳ τύφετ' ἐνὶ κραδίῳ·

⁵² On the Twentieth, see Clay (1986: *test.* 6–11). On its confusion with the birthday of Epicurus, celebrated on the twentieth of Gamelion, *test.* 2–5 and Sider (1997: 157–8).

⁵³ P. Herc. 1232 fr. 8 col. 1 = Clay (1986: *test.* 16).

⁵⁴ For Epicurean views on right livelihood see Asmis (1990: 2387–9).

αὐτὴν ἀλλὰ τάχιστα κορωνίδα γράψατε, Μοῦσαι,
ταύτης ἡμετέρης, δεσπότιδες, μανίης.

Seven years are added to thirty,
already the columns of my life are divided in half;
already white hair dusts me, Xanthippe,
proclaiming the age of reason.
But yet I still care for the twang of the lyre and for revels,
and the fire burns in my insatiate heart.
But, Goddess Muses, mark her at once as a symbol
of the end of this, our madness.

(Philodemus 17 GP *Garland* = AP 11.41 = 4 Sider)

Here the poet admits that he has not lost his taste for music, celebration and passion, but now that he has reached the age of reason, asks the Muses to inscribe Xanthippe as the *koronis* to his madness. It is not clear whether Xanthippe, who is featured in several of his poems, is a mask for a real woman in Philodemus' life, as Sider argues,⁵⁵ or a fiction, but she is named for Socrates' wife and is therefore the ideal companion for a philosopher, perhaps a symbol of philosophy itself. The *koronis* was a mark sometimes used by scribes to indicate the end of a poem or a section of a larger work in the margins of a papyrus roll. Here, in language of the literary trade, the poet imagines his life as columns of script on a roll which has now reached its midpoint,⁵⁶ marked by a *koronis* in the form of Xanthippe.⁵⁷ Philosophy, personified as the quintessential philosopher's wife, will put an end to carousing in the second half of his life.

Finally, in our last example, it is the wisdom of age that has successfully brought about a change in the poet's lifestyle:

ἡράσθην. τίς δ' οὐχί; κεκόμακα. τίς δ' ἀμύητος
κόμων; ἀλλ' ἐμάνην ἐκ τίνος; οὐχὶ θεοῦ;
ἐρρίφθω, πολλὴ γὰρ ἐπέγεται ἀντὶ μελαίνης
θριξ ἤδη, συνετῆς ἄγγελος ἡλικίης.
καὶ παίζειν ὅτε καιρός, ἐπαίξαμεν· ἥνικα καὶ νῦν
οὐκέτι, λωϊτέρης φροντίδος ἀψόμεθα.

⁵⁵ On the significance of Xanthippe's name, see Sider (1997: 36–9) who considers it likely that she is a real person, indeed, Philodemus' wife.

⁵⁶ The interpretation of Philodemus' book of life is from Giangrande (1973c: 142–5) against Gow-Page (1968: 2.386).

⁵⁷ Griffiths (1970b) argues that the *koronis* in the text refers to an actual *koronis* following the poem which would indicate that it was the last epigram in Philodemus' book. The thesis is rejected by Sider (1997: 40).

I loved. Who has not? I was a reveler. Who is uninitiated
 in the revels? But I was driven mad on whose account? A god, no?
 Let it go, for already gray hair, which announces the age of reason,
 drives away the black.
 When it was the time to play, we played. And now when it is
 no longer, we will fix upon better thoughts.
 (Philodemus 18 GP *Garland* = *AP* 5.112 = 5 Sider)

We do not, of course, know the original order of these poems, and the suggestion of a progression in attitude as Philodemus' philosophical persona masters the excesses of his artistic one may well be an illusion. Nevertheless, for Philodemus the issue has the appearance of being personal and this is underscored by the psychological realism of the way it is played and replayed in his work. We know from Cicero that Piso, at least, had a genuinely libertine lifestyle (*in Pisonem* 13; 22; 67) which drew Philodemus in (*in Pisonem* 70–2), and this can be contrasted with the considerable remains of Philodemus' prose works on important philosophical subjects. Philodemus aimed to be a philosopher, but among the Hellenistic philosophical schools and especially the Epicureans, writing learned treatises was not enough to win the respect of one's philosophical peers. Hellenistic philosophy is deeply ethical, less about making arguments and more about conducting one's own life in accordance with principles demonstrated by the life of the founder.⁵⁸ Disposition (*diathesis*), which is revealed by action rather than words, is the most important criterion, and for Stoics and Epicureans self-mastery (*enkrateia*) is an important component of it. That is why Timon's *Silloi*, which mercilessly lampoons the characters of its philosopher subjects, is a genuine piece of Skeptical philosophy.

The narrator of Philodemus' epigrams is shown struggling with Epicurean standards of conduct. Even if none of the details offered up in the poems are autobiography, strictly speaking,⁵⁹ the challenge of reconciling these opposing trends in Philodemus' own life is expressed through his art. This is not simply philosophy as a topic treated in epigram, but a true marriage of Hellenistic epigram and philosophy.

⁵⁸ On the primacy of ethics in Hellenistic philosophy generally, see Long (1993), and among the Epicureans specifically, Clay (1983: 269–70).

⁵⁹ On Philodemus' epigrams as autobiography, Gigante (1995: 49–61).

PART FIVE

RECEPTION

HELLENISTIC EPIGRAM IN THE ROMAN WORLD FROM THE BEGINNINGS TO THE END OF THE REPUBLICAN AGE

Alfredo M. Morelli

1. *Roman inscriptional epigram*

The reception of Greek epigram in the Roman milieu must be viewed in the larger historical context in which Hellenistic poetic genres progressively took root there. Relevant factors include the means of transmission and actual knowledge in Rome of Greek epigram as a distinct genre; the selection and re-elaboration of pertinent features by social and cultural élites; and literary and epigraphic production in Latin and its social importance (in particular, the continuous mutual influence between inscriptional and literary epigram, in Greek and Latin).

What first attracted Roman society to inscribed epigram was its eulogistic potential. This it adapted to its own ends. Poetic *elogia* in Latin are well attested at least from approximately 230 B.C. (*CIL* I² 9, an epitaph for Lucius Cornelius Scipio, Barbatus' son). The *Scipionum elogia* represent "the first Hellenistic epigrams at Rome":¹ commissioned and produced by the same cultural élites that introduced literary practices in Rome, such epigraphic poetry "played a notable role in establishing literary customs and forms."² There is no reason to consider these poems as representative of a "native" poetic genre, distinct from Hellenistic epigram.³ The Greek genre supplies poetic forms, conventions, motifs, and a prestigious frame in which it is also possible to reshape ancient Roman topics of eulogy. The first two *elogia* follow:

CIL I² 9

*Honc oino plorume cosentiont R[omane
duonoro optumo fuise viro,*

CIL I² 7

*Cornelius Lucius Scipio Barbatus,
Gnaivod patre prognatus, fortis vir
sapiensque,*

¹ Van Sickle (1988). See also Morelli (2000: 11–35; 49–55).

² Cugusi (2004: 167).

³ Galletier (1922: 191–5). Now again Massaro (2002: 19–23) and Suerbaum (2002: 335).

*Luciom Scipione. Filios Barbati
consol censor aidilis hec fuit apud vos.
Hec cepit Corsica Aleriaque urbe,
dedet Tempestatebus aide mereto[d.*

*quoius forma virtutei parisuma fuit,
consol censor aidilis quei fuit apud vos.
Taurasia Cisauna Samnio cepit,
subigit omne Loucanam opsidesque
abdoucit.*

This man Lucius Scipio, as most
agree, was the very best of all men
at Rome. A son of Long-beard, he
was aedile, consul and censor
among you. He it was who captured
Corsica,
Aleria too, a city. To the
Goddesses of
Weather he gave deservedly a
temple.
(trans. Warmington)

Lucius Cornelius Scipio
Long-beard,
Gnaeus' begotten son, a valiant
gentleman
and wise, whose fine form alone
matched
his bravery, was aedile, consul
and censor
among you; he took Taurasia
and Cisauna,
in fact Samnium; he overcame
all the
Lucanian land and brought
hostages therefrom.
(trans. Warmington)

The poems' couplets are skilfully disposed, imitating the distichs of Greek epigram, though in Saturnian meter.⁴ *CIL* I² 9 opens with a two-line sentence about the fame and prestige of the deceased (i.e., indirectly, his *virtutes*); the name of the honorand does not occur until the opening of the third line (*Luciom Scipione*). Such enjambment of the deceased's name at the beginning of the second distich, known in both epigraphic and literary Greek epigrams, creates expectation and poetic suspense.⁵ The *elogium* goes on to introduce a patronymic (*filios Barbati*) and a *cursus* of the deceased which fill out the second couplet, followed by a strong syntactical pause. The last two lines describe the *res gestae* of the deceased. Barbatus' *elogium* (*CIL* I² 7), written probably 30 to 40 years later than *CIL* I² 9,⁶ is a skilful re-elaboration of the same pattern. The name of the deceased, a patronymic clause and an appositive phrase (*fortis vir sapiensque*) celebrating Barbatus' *virtutes* fill the first couplet; two relative clauses (3, *quoius*...; 4, *quei*...) take up the following two lines, picking up the contents of the first couplet

⁴ Van Sickle (1987: 48–9), with further bibliography: *contra* Goldberg (1995: 63, n. 7); Massaro (2002: 21–2).

⁵ *GVI* 1697; *AP* 7.54, 7.730. Morelli (2000: 25–6).

⁶ Morelli (2000: 14–6), with bibliography; Massaro (2002: 18–9, n. 4). *Contra* Kruschwitz (2002: 35).

and mirroring *CIL* I² 9.1–4 by a chiasitic re-arrangement of its themes (see chart below). Line 3 elaborates the *virtutes* mentioned at the end of 2; and 4 illustrates the *cursus* of the deceased, which in the *elogium* of Barbatus' son Lucius immediately (and logically) followed the name and patronymic of the deceased.

CIL I² 91–2: *virtutes* (B)3–4: name, patronymic, *cursus* (A)*CIL* I² 7

1–2: name and patronymic (A)

2: *virtutes* (B)3: *virtutes* (B)4: *cursus* (A)

The inversion of the logical sequence—name, *cursus*, *virtutes*—in *CIL* I² 9 is rejected in Barbatus' *elogium* to achieve an even more artful structure. The *aemulatio* continues in the last two lines' account of the *res gestae* of the deceased. In *CIL* I² 9 the structure of line 5 (*hec cepit Corsica Aleriaque urbe*) is bipartite, linked by a conjunction which pairs the name of the conquered island (*Corsica*) with its main town (*Aleriaque*) in the second half of the line; the verb *cepit* falls in the first half. In *CIL* I² 7, by contrast, line 5 builds to cumulative effect through an asyndetic tricolon (*Taurasia Cisauna Samnio*), with the name of the conquered land (*Samnio*) probably following and embracing the towns enumerated in the first half of the line;⁷ the verb *cepit* is placed in the second hemistich. Verse 6 of *CIL* I² 9 is composed of a single narrative sentence (*dedet Tempestatebus aide merito*[d]); *CIL* I² 7.6 is bipartite and bound in the middle by the enclitic *-que*; the verbs *subigit* and *abdoucit* frame the accusatives *Loucanam* and *opsides*; their historical present elegantly varies the perfect *cepit* of the previous line and contrasts with the perfect tense maintained throughout *CIL* I² 9 (see in particular the last line: *dedet*).⁸ The artistry of this *variatio* is exquisite, to say nothing of other important stylistic and topical features.⁹ What are both of these *elogia* if not Graeco-Roman epigrams?

At the same time, it is clear that both poems reproduce the contents and style of a *laudatio funebris*, the typical speech delivered at an

⁷ It is still uncertain whether Taurasia and Cisauna were actually Samnite towns: Kruschwitz (2002: 44), with bibliography.

⁸ Courtney (1995: 225) correctly compares the final line in Tuditanus' inscription, *CIL* I² 652, also in Saturnian verse.

⁹ Fuller analysis in Morelli (2000: 23–35), with bibliography; add the illuminating remarks of Fraenkel (1960: 340, n. 1).

aristocratic Roman funeral.¹⁰ Themes are organized in different units illustrating in detail the political career, innate qualities and deeds of the deceased; and the style is plain and sober, yielding slightly to bombast only in the *virtutes*-section. In the case of Barbatus' *elogium*, probably written some 80 years later than the date of his death, a copy of the *laudatio* from the family archive was likely used.¹¹ But an *elogium* is not simply a versified summary of a *laudatio*. Rather, it adapts motifs of the *laudatio*, orders them with different syntax, and reinterprets them in light of Greek epigrammatic convention. At line 4 of both *elogia*, *apud vos* even seems to reproduce the actual circumstances under which the speech was performed, hinting at a Roman funeral gathering; yet it also reflects the typical epigrammatic address to a passerby. This in turn is adapted to new circumstances consistent with its monumental setting, as it targets Roman visitors to the Scipiones' tomb: the *elogia* thus transform both the audience of an aristocratic funeral and the anonymous, inattentive ὁδοιπóρος or reader of Greek epigram into timeless Roman readers and admirers (giving new life in Rome to the old public spirit of Greek epigram and evoking the presence of the civic community in many Hellenistic epitaphs).¹² The synthesis of Roman and Greek cultural features is total: epigrammatic art and concision serve here to immortalize the *laudatio*.

The poetic text is only part of a complex strategy involving the monument as a whole, its appearance and placement. Cicero's statements about the Scipiones' family tomb (*Fin.* 2.116; *Tusc.* 1.13) leave little doubt about the fame and prestige it enjoyed still in his time: it was a sort of *paradeigma* of aristocratic preeminence (if not arrogance) in archaic Rome. The monument was placed near the Porta Capena among other noble family tombs (cp. Cic. *Tusc.* 1.13, *an tu egressus porta Capena cum Calatini Scipionum Serviliorum Metellorum sepulcra vides, miseros putas illos?*), along one of the busiest roads to the city: a spectacular display of aristocratic power for the passerby. The *Scipionum elogia* were inside and thus not visible from the road; nevertheless they were certainly famous, as were *elogia* from other nobles' tombs in the same area.¹³ The poetic forms and eulogistic motifs selected from Greek

¹⁰ Kierdorf (1980); Flower (1996: 128–58); Suerbaum (2002: 518–23), with further bibliography.

¹¹ Suerbaum (2002: 339) correctly also stresses the influence of *annales pontificum*.

¹² Morelli (2000: 30).

¹³ The *elogium* of Calatinus (*apud* Cic. *Cato* 61; *Fin.* 2.116) emulates *CIL* I² 9. The

epigram for such aristocratic poetry still remained prominent in many later Latin epigraphic poems.

The second and first centuries B.C. witnessed a flowering of votive and funerary epigram, involving first and foremost the new, rising social ranks: not just (or mostly) *equites*, but freedmen, craftsmen, and frequently persons with Greek names and origins. Hellenistic inscriptional poetry exercised a direct influence, but the language and meters of the Latin stage (above all tragedy) played a notable role too in the formative process of Roman epigraphic poetry. At the same time, the ancient tradition of aristocratic inscribed epigram remains relevant to the evolution of Latin epigram. As the first impetus to inscriptional poetry had derived from the *elogia* and from bombastic triumphal votive inscriptions accompanying public offerings in urban temples, the emerging social classes at Rome came to regard the commissioning of an epigraphic poem as a sort of status symbol. Thus funerary poetry is marked by public-spiritedness and eulogistic features; it emphasizes the ongoing esteem and prestige (*laus*) the deceased enjoyed in the community; its rhetoric of praise is grounded on parallelisms, antithesis and comparative effects (*CIL* I² 9.1–2: *hunc oino plorume... / duonoro optumo*; *CIL* I² 7.3 *forma virtutei parisuma*). While such features are present in some Greek funerary epigrams, they owe the prominence they enjoyed in Rome to the old tradition of the aristocratic *elogium*. Of course, some topics and poetic habits became fashionable due to the prestige of Ennius' literary epigrams; but the influence of the aristocratic model is also evident in some features of the epigraphic layout:¹⁴ there is a clear distinction between prose sections (including onomastic and biographical data) and the eulogistic poem; and the verse inscription is carefully disposed, for instance, through the frequent indentation of the pentameter.

Many such traits of aristocratic *elogium* are present, for instance, in the first century B.C. poem found at Triaectum on the Liris (southern Latium), *CIL* I² 1570 (= *CLE* 56). But far from honoring someone of the nobility, it is dedicated to a freedwoman, Publia Horaea, who married the son of her master Nicia(s), himself a freedman. The poem is focused on praise throughout, with no room for grief or regret. The deceased describes her deeds and virtues in the first person. But significantly, here

consensus about the deceased's qualities concerns not just the Roman community, but also all foreign peoples: this is the meaning of *gentes* (1), *pace* Courtney (1995: 220); see Kruschwitz (2002: 222).

¹⁴ Del Hoyo (2002) has recently analyzed Hispanic inscriptions.

the aristocratic ideology of *honor* is replaced by the *decorum* and *ornatus* of the emerging new classes. Between the second and first centuries B.C., lower social ranks combined ancient ideological and rhetorical devices in a new world of social values: here, individuals enjoyed a sense of dignity and social prestige not in the larger community of the *cives*, but in a smaller milieu where they felt pride in reaching a decent social status (particularly evident in epigrams for freedmen).

As soon as verse epitaph came to symbolize status for such social ranks it was abandoned, as it stands to reason, by the same aristocratic élites who introduced it to Rome: the last *elogium* in the tomb of the *Scipiones* (*CIL* I² 15) is dated to approximately 135 B.C. Suspicion of Hellenizing cultural fashions was probably strong from the beginning (the “Roman” aspect of the first *elogia* is probably the fruit of a cultural compromise); it also played a role in the decline of the aristocratic verse *elogium*. In any case, the fashion for funerary verse inscription among the upper classes and in the “centers of power” gained a foothold again only in late antiquity.¹⁵

2. *Literary epigram from Ennius to Lutatius Catulus*

The groups that introduced inscriptional poetry into Rome were also responsible for the first literary epigrams. Our starting point is Ennius, who experimented with this among many other Hellenizing genres. Fragments of his funerary poems for Scipio Africanus are transmitted by Cicero and Seneca minor.

Enn. *Var.* 19–20 V.² (= fr. 43 Courtney = Cic. *Leg.* 2.57 and Sen. *Epist.* 108.33):

*Hic est ille situs, cui nemo civis neque hostis
Quiviv pro factis reddere opis pretium.*

Here lies the man, whom no one, countryman or enemy, was able to pay back adequately for his deeds.

Enn. *Var.* 21–2 V.² (= fr. 44.1–2 Courtney = Cic. *Tusc.* 5.49: see also Mamert. *Pan. Lat.* 11(12).16.3):

*A sole exoriente supra Maeotis paludes
Nemo est qui factis aequiperare queat.*

¹⁵ Cugusi (2004: 167–9).

From the rising of the sun above the marshes of Maeotis comes no one whose deeds could balance his. (trans. Warmington)

Enn. *Var.* 23–4 V.² (= fr. 44.3–4 Courtney = Cic. *Rep.* fr. 6 p. 137 Zieg. = Sen. *Epist.* 108.34; see also Lact. *Div. Inst.* 1.18.11):

*Si fas endo plagas caelestium ascendere cuiquam est,
Mi soli caeli maxima porta patet.*

If it is right for anyone to go up into the regions of heaven's dwellers, for me alone heaven's great gate lies open. (trans. Warmington)

There are many problems in restoring and interpreting these texts.¹⁶ The epigrammatic nature of at least *Var.* 19–20 V.² can hardly be questioned: its first sentence, *hic est ille situs*, followed by a relative clause, is modelled on clichés of Roman funerary epigram, and it probably exerted considerable influence on later inscriptional poetry.¹⁷ In *Var.* 23–4 V.² and possibly in *Var.* 21–2 V.² Scipio speaks in the first person; many scholars wish to combine both distichs into just one epigram (see also below):¹⁸ though probable, this is not certain.

The poems exhibit marked Hellenizing: a new, Greek meter is introduced and the language owes much to Homeric and tragic solemnity.¹⁹ In 19 V.² *hostis* means *stricto sensu* “enemy,” not “stranger, foreign person,” as in the parallel *elogium* for Sulla in the Campus Martius, which very probably imitates Ennius’ for Scipio.²⁰ Greek epigram from its beginnings played with similar ideas: the deceased was “appreciated by citizens and foreigners” (e.g., *CEG* 112.1); even enemies, by their defeat, testify to the deceased’s value (Aeschylus 2 *FGE* pp. 131–2 = *vita Aeschyli* p. 332 Page). There are also traditional motifs that Roman *elogium* associated with the deceased’s excellence among his fellow citizens. Ennius re-elaborates, modifies and adapts for Scipio such ancient *topoi*, even by inversion. Thus the clause *cui nemo civis neque hostis quivit pro*

¹⁶ Courtney (1993: 39–42); Bosworth (1999: 5); Morelli (2000: 36–40); Suerbaum (2002: 132), with further bibliography.

¹⁷ Courtney (1993: 40); Morelli (2000: 37). Perhaps already *CIL* I² 11.4 alludes to Ennius’ distich.

¹⁸ See already Scaliger (1573: 193), and Skutsch (1985: 148); Perutelli (1990: 275); Courtney (1993: 40–1), with further bibliography. Vahlen (1903: 216–7) takes a more cautious approach.

¹⁹ Morelli (2000: 40–1).

²⁰ Setaioli (1977: 700); Courtney (1993: 40); Suerbaum (2002: 338). At any rate, in Sulla’s epitaph (paraphrasis in Plut. *Sull.* 38.4) φίλοι and ἐχθροί are personal friends and rivals (citizens and strangers) of the deceased.

factis reddere opis pretium means one thing for the countryman (*civis*)—i.e., that he was unable “to render for Scipio’s pains a recompense fitting his services”—but another for the foeman (*hostis*).²¹ In archaic literary Latin both *pretium* and *ops* are *voces mediae* which may also have negative connotations.²² For the *hostis*, then, what is meant is that none was able to “make Scipio pay the penalty” of his war exploits, hinting perhaps at Rome’s foe *par excellence* in this period, Hannibal. But what does it mean that no citizen could “adequately reward” Scipio? Ennius is probably critiquing Scipio’s ungrateful fatherland.²³ The epigram was actually inscribed (or at least alleged to be) on Scipio’s tomb at Liternum. As Livy states (38.53.8), Scipio ordered that he should be buried there *ne finus sibi in ingrata patria fieret*. A breach between individual and his nation had occurred; the *consensus* of the Roman people, or even of all the world, was no longer the guarantee of the deceased’s *virtus* and excellence. Scipio’s personality stands out as haughty and ostentatious toward citizens and enemies alike (and contrary to eulogistic tradition both Roman and Greek).²⁴

In Skutsch’s opinion, Enn. *Var.* 21–4 V.² was modelled on Alcaeus of Messene 1 GP (= *AP* 9.518).²⁵ If this is correct, Ennius transforms the bombastic (perhaps ironic?) eulogy of the still living Philip into a funerary epigram that deifies the dead Scipio; Philip’s challenge to Zeus in Alcaeus becomes Scipio’s ascent to heaven; and Alcaeus’ address to the god, almost blasphemous to the Roman sensibilities, is replaced by the more religious formula *si fas endo plagas caelestium ascendere cuiquam est*. Ennius’ epigram may also conceal a jab at its model, in stressing that *mi soli caeli maxima porta patet*. Scipio alone (and not Philip or other Hellenistic sovereigns) has the right to rise to Olympus. The comparison is now between Scipio and other historical personalities, in particular Hellenistic kings and perhaps the archetypal figure of Alexander the Great, confirmed by the emphasis on the Eastern side of the Mediter-

²¹ So Warmington (1935–40: 1.401).

²² Setaioli (1977: 700–1 and 705). Examples are collected in *TLL*: *ops*, 9.2.806.34–45 (Kuhlmann) and *pretium* 10.2.1210.39–49 (Michael Hillen). Add Naev. *trag.* 8 R.³ *pretium pro factis ferat* (the idiom *pro factis pretium* recurs, e.g., in Plaut. *Capt.* 940).

²³ A hint at a eulogistic motif is also possible: Setaioli (1977: 701–2).

²⁴ The motif of the ungrateful country (likewise for a deceased buried in a foreign land) may be found in a Diodorus’ epigram for Aeschylus, 13.3–4 GP (= *AP* 7.40.3–4). There are probably other allusions in Ennius’ work to Scipio’s falling into disgrace; see Morelli (2000: 38).

²⁵ Skutsch (1985: 148).

ranean (*a sole exoriente supra Maeotis paludes*).²⁶ While Ennius states Scipio's superiority in a very Roman way—by comparison of *facta* (*nemo est qui factis aequiperare queat*: see the almost contemporary formula in Publius Scipio's *elogium*, *CIL* I² 10.5, *facile facteis superases gloria maiorum*)—apotheosis *post mortem* is alien to the traditional, conservative Roman aristocratic mentality. There was, of course, the *exemplum* of the heroized Hercules and, above all, Romulus-Quirinus; but in the first decades of the second century B.C. reshaping such models to outstanding contemporary individuals appeared strange and dangerous. Ennius goes far beyond the traditional Pythagoreanism of Roman social and cultural élites in exploiting Hellenistic court epigram and, more broadly, poetry and culture:²⁷ his Euhemerism, too, breaks the mold.²⁸

Two further distichs are ascribed to Ennius by Cic. *Tusc.* 1.34 and 117: an epigram on his own portrait (*Var.* 15–6 V.² = fr. 45 Courtney) and a self-epitaph (*Var.* 17–8 V.² = fr. 46 Courtney).²⁹ Although Cicero's source seems to be a work of Varro, it is clear that neither distich was written by that author. Nor are they by Ennius (especially 15–6 V.²). Rather they were produced some time after the beginnings of Latin philology, which was at first particularly devoted to *pater Ennius* and earlier epic poetry. Later interest in stage genres³⁰ subsequently produced alleged funerary epigrams by Naevius, Plautus and Pacuvius on themselves (Gell. 1.24.1–4; probably, at least for Plautus, from Varro's *De poetis*).³¹ The epigram for Pacuvius is contemporary with his death and may be authentic;³² the remaining two are erudite products, perhaps even

²⁶ Skutsch (1985: 148) suggests a lacuna immediately before 22 V.², because not all cardinal points of the *oikoumene* are mentioned at 21 V.²; see also Courtney (1993: 41–2). But Ennius could be stressing comparison precisely with the Hellenistic world. Geographical limits only for East and North (once again Maeotis, i.e., the Sea of Azov) are present also in a passage which clearly imitates Ennius' poem, Verg. *Aen.* 6.798ff.; see Bosworth (1999: 1–5).

²⁷ Bettini (1979: 85–7); Skutsch (1985); Courtney (1993: 41); Morelli (2000: 39–40).

²⁸ Winiarczyk (2002: 123–42).

²⁹ Suerbaum (1968: 208–14; 333–6); Lausberg (1982: 275–7); Skutsch (1985: 146–7); Courtney (1993: 42–3); Morelli (2000: 41–7).

³⁰ Suerbaum (1968: 214, n. 631); Morelli (2000: 46–7). On the evolution of early Latin philology, see now Goldberg (2005: 17–9 and bibliography 29–30).

³¹ *FPL* pp. 28 and 32 Morel; 39–40 and 43–4 Büchner; 72–4 Blänsdorf; Courtney (1993: 47–50).

³² Morelli (2000: 47–8 and 84–5). Dahlmann (1963: 100) and Ekkehard Stärk *apud* Suerbaum (2002: 157, with further bibliography) think differently. On relationships with *CLE* 53 and 848, see Massaro (1992: 12–8) and (1998).

by the same author, from the period between the Gracchi and Sulla.³³ In the Greek and Roman milieu, epigrammatic eulogies of poets and writers parallel biographical literature, and their production or at least their transmission is connected with the erudite genre of *Vitae poetarum*.³⁴ In Roman epigrams, typical themes include the grief and pain felt by Muses and other divine beings over the poet's death (the epigrams for Naevius and Plautus),³⁵ and the poet's undying fame (Enn. *Var.* 17–8 V.²).³⁶ Sometimes we recognize the influence of the older aristocratic *elogium*, with some epicizing emphasis.³⁷ There is also an erudite tendency to refer to features of the poet's work or its importance to the development of Roman literature (especially in Naevius' and Plautus' epigrams). In general, we see how Romans became sensitive to the importance of their literary traditions: they reveal *in nuce* that same tendency toward heroizing the main figures of literary past as one sees in Hellenistic poetry.³⁸

Another important, though often neglected, figure in the history of Roman literary epigram is Lucilius, of whose work we possess but a few scraps in elegiacs, mostly from book 22 of his *Satirae*.

The most significant (579–80 Marx) is a distich transmitted by Don. *Ter. Phorm.* 287:

*Servus neque infidus domino neque inutilis quaquam
Lucili columella hic situs Metrophanes.*

Here lies a slave who was both faithful and in all ways useful to his master, a little pillar of Lucilius' house, by name Metrophanes. (trans. Warmington)

Metrophanes' poetic epitaph was the first for a slave in Rome. Martial (11.90.4) quotes its second line as an instance of old-fashioned taste, and

³³ Courtney (1993: 50).

³⁴ Gabathuler (1937); Dahlmann (1963: 70–100); Bing (1993a).

³⁵ In Hellenistic epigram we find honors for the dead poet more frequently than the Muses' and other gods' grief. Compare with Naevius' epigram two poems by Alcaeus of Messene: 11 GP (= AP 7.1), grief of the gods *vs.* unworthiness of men; and 14 GP (= AP 7.412), gods cry and men stop sympotic activities because of Pilades' descent to Hades. See also Suerbaum (1968: 304–5); Morelli (2000: 43–6).

³⁶ See especially Enn. *Var.* 18 V.² *volito vivos per ora virum*. See Lennartz (1999); Morelli (2000: 43).

³⁷ See especially Enn. *Var.* 15–6 V.² The word order is sophisticated, but the eulogy is quite sober with its indication of the name and deeds of the deceased; the address to *cives* is remarkable. Fine analysis in Skutsch (1968: 25–6); Bettini (1979: 83–4); Lausberg (1982: 275–6).

³⁸ Rossi (2001: 81–106).

this is in keeping with the fact that the couplet was not just appreciated by archaizing scholars of the late first century A.D., but also reused in *CLE*.³⁹ At the same time, it exhibits a degree of Roman-Hellenistic refinement: *neque inutilis quaquam* is an artful translation of the most frequent epithet in *CEG*, that used for “good slaves” in the Greek milieu, *χρηστός*.⁴⁰ Its style, moreover, employs sophisticated word order, and combines formulae typical of the Roman funerary tradition (*hic situs*) with faint echoes of a grander literary tradition, yet in the manner of the *sermo humilis*. The diminutive *columella* tones down the hyperbolic epic-tragic phrasing (see Enn. *Ann.* 343 Sk. *regni... colummam*). In all, we find a sense of decorum mixed with a certain irony, and a new taste for slang.⁴¹ Similarly, the other elegiac fragments from book 22 (581–4 Marx) are strongly influenced by Plautine style.⁴² It cannot be determined whether all fragments belong to epigrams or to longer elegies.

Roman cultural élites also experimented with new epigrammatic types under the influence of contemporary Greek culture, in particular with erotic epigram. Gellius transmits amatory poems by Valerius Aedituus, Porcius Licinus and Lutatius Catulus in a famous chapter of his *Noctes Atticae* (19.9); from Cic. *Nat. deor.* 1.79 we also know another epigram of Catulus (2 Morel = 2 Courtney).⁴³ Aedituus, Licinus and Catulus are mentioned in the same order and in a similar context by Apul. *Apol.* 9.6, who does not depend on Gellius. On this and other evidence, it has been suggested for more than a century that all three poets belonged to a circle under the patronage of Lutatius Catulus,⁴⁴ or at least that their epigrams were part of a Latin anthology which circulated among erudite readers of the second century A.D.⁴⁵ Although there is not enough evidence for either suggestion,⁴⁶ the poems’ impressive consistency in

³⁹ Massaro (1992: 10); Morelli (2000: 114), with further literature.

⁴⁰ Rossi (2001: 319–22).

⁴¹ See Donatus’ commentary (if it is not baseless): “ancient people defined older slaves as *columellae*.”

⁴² Morelli (2000: 121–7).

⁴³ After Courtney (1993: 70–8), general studies of so-called pre-neoteric epigrams may be found in Bernardi Perini (1997); Maltby (1997); Biondi (1998a: 431–7); Nosarti (1999: 151–74); Morelli (2000: 131–237); Vardi (2000); and Suerbaum (2002: 290–1; 452–3).

⁴⁴ Buettner (1892: 110).

⁴⁵ Usener (1865: 151).

⁴⁶ On the *status quaestionis*, see Granarolo (1971: 32–6) and (1973: 312–4) and Courtney (1993: 71); thereafter, the inconclusive surveys of Morelli (2000: 131–45) and Vardi (2000), with further literature.

subject matter and style suggests that a particular fashion for amatory epigram took hold at Rome at the end of the second or the beginning of the first century B.C.

The best known of the three poets was Lutatius Catulus.⁴⁷ A member of the Sullan aristocracy, consul with Marius in 102 B.C., victor over the Cimbri, he committed suicide in 87 B.C., as Marius' party temporarily prevailed. His literary interests were expansive: like other aristocrats of this period (Scaurus, Rutilius Rufus, Sulla), he wrote an autobiography (*Liber de consulatu et de rebus gestis suis*) dedicated to Furius Antias (Cic. *Brut.* 132); and he knew and protected Greek epigrammists such as Antipater of Sidon (Cic. *De or.* 3.194) and Archias (Cic. *Arch.* 6). As we read in Pliny the Younger (*Epist.* 5.3), people like Sulla or Quintus Scaevola composed erotic epigrams. When did such a literary fashion begin in the Roman aristocracy? Did it originate in the *Garland* of Meleager, as many scholars think?⁴⁸

In my opinion, evidence argues against such a suggestion, at least in case of Lutatius Catulus. If, as is probable, Meleager's *Garland* was not published before 80 B.C.,⁴⁹ Catulus' use of it is simply impossible. If the *Garland* was assembled circa 96 B.C. (and it is reasonable to assume that its arrival in Rome would have required a few years more), it is hard to believe that a poem like Catulus 2 was written for Roscius when he was approximately thirty, whereas Cicero speaks in this context of poems exalting beautiful young *adulescentuli* or *pueri*. In both cases, we must keep in mind that Catulus was in contact, well before the end of the second century B.C., with important epigrammists such as Antipater and Archias. Meleager states that Antipater was a noteworthy erotic poet (122.15–6 GP = AP 7.428.15–6). Although only one (homo)erotic poem of his has survived to our day (65 GP = AP 12.97),⁵⁰ it is enough to acknowledge Antipater's possible contribution to new Roman epigrammatic tastes.⁵¹ It is, all the same, impossible to establish whether all pre-neoteric epigrams precede Meleager's *Garland*. As a whole they have to be envisaged as important evidence for a Graeco-Roman literary movement that preceded and accompanied the *Garland*, and was in its turn fostered by the great success of Meleager's anthology. Anti-

⁴⁷ Bardon (1952: 115–21).

⁴⁸ Laurens (1989: 159–77); Cameron (1993: 51–6).

⁴⁹ See Argentieri in this volume.

⁵⁰ The epitaph for the hetaira Lais (23 GP = AP 7.218) is also remarkable.

⁵¹ Morelli (2000: 146–52).

pater was surely just one of the intermediaries for the spread of such a taste to Rome. Similarly, the poetry of Laevius is largely influenced by Hellenistic epigram.⁵²

Such influence is evident in Catulus 2 Courtney, the poem on Roscius. Noteworthy features are the playful conceit and artful “Phoenician” style, with its jokes about the *puer*’s name, and a hyperbolic comparison between the boy’s and a god’s (Dawn’s) beauty.⁵³ Similar tendencies appear in contemporary Hellenistic epigrammatists, such as Antipater, Polystratus or Phanias, or the many anonymous poems of the *Garland*, without any evidence of strong specific influence by Meleager or his anthology.⁵⁴ The superiority of the beloved to the gods is a topos Hellenistic erotic epigram inherited from royal encomium; at Rome it is colored by the humorous Plautine tradition of *synkrisis* (comparison) and, with reference to epigram in particular, by the example of Scipio’s “deification” in Enn. *Var.* 21–4 V.² (= 44 Courtney).⁵⁵ By simulating a lover’s frenzy, then, in exalting his darling’s qualities, Catulus’ epigram exhibits a radical change in cultural mood from bombastic political eulogy to erotic (and ironic) refinement.

In contemporary Greek literature (including Meleager), this period witnesses a kind of revival of early Hellenistic epigram (Callimachus, Posidippus, Asclepiades).⁵⁶ Catulus 1 Morel (= 1 Courtney), for example,

*Aufugit mi animus. Credo, ut solet, ad Theotimum
devenit. Sic est, perfugium illud habet.
Quid si non interdixem, ne illunc fugitivum
mitteret ad se intro, sed magis eiceret?
Ibimus quaesitum. Verum, ne ipsi teneamur,
formido. Quid ago? Da, Venus, consilium.*

My soul has left me; it has fled, I think, to Theotimus; he is its refuge. But what if I should beg that he refuse to admit the truant, but cast it out? I’ll go to him; but what if I am caught? What shall I do? Lend me, Venus, your aid. (trans. after Rolfe)

⁵² Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 463).

⁵³ On Catulus 2 Morel, see also Granarolo (1971: 49–50); Dahlmann (1981); Perutelli (1990); Weber (1996).

⁵⁴ *Contra* Laurens (1989: 174–5), who compares some of Meleager’s poems such as 100 GP (= AP 12.59).

⁵⁵ On relationships between Catulus’ and Ennius’ epigrams, Perutelli (1990: 275–6); Biondi (1998a: 432–3); Morelli (2000: 161–2).

⁵⁶ See Argentieri in this volume.

is an artful translation of Callimachus 4 GP (= AP 12.73 = 41 Pf.):

ἥμισύ μεν ψυχῆς ἔτι τὸ πνέον, ἥμισυ δ' οὐκ οἶδ'
 εἶτ' Ἔρος εἶτ' Αἰδης ἥρπασε, πλὴν ἀφανές.
 ἦ ῥά τιν' ἐς παίδων πάλιν ᾤχετο; καὶ μὲν ἀπείπον
 πολλάκι τὴν δρῆστιν μὴ ἔπεχεσθε†, νέοι'
 †οὐκισυνιφησον† ἐκέισε γὰρ ἡ λιθόλευστος
 κείνη καὶ δύσεως οἶδ' ὅτι που στρέφεται.

It is but the half of my soul that still breathes, and for the other half I know not if it be Love or Death that hath seized on it, only it is gone. Is it off again to one of the lads? And yet I told them often, "Receive not, ye young men, the runaway." Seek for it at **, for I know it is somewhere there that the gallows-bird, the love-lorn, is loitering. (trans. Paton)

Compared with Callimachus and his contemporaries, we find the speaker more deeply involved in his erotic affair: as evidenced by the syntax of Catulus 1, which is more broken and uneven than in its model, love is passion, pain, and subjection to Eros or sometimes even to the beloved. Callimachus' poem is reinterpreted in the mood of a Latin *μωρολογία* (lover's comic monologue), strongly influenced by the colloquial language and style of the *adulescentes amatores* in the comedies of both Plautus and Terence.⁵⁷ In its approach to love affairs, pre-neoteric epigram, like contemporary Hellenistic poetry, also refers to important models of archaic Greek erotic poetry, primarily Sappho: hints at Sapphic poems are already evident in Lutatius Catulus,⁵⁸ while Valerius Aedituus (1 Morel = 1 Courtney) adapts the famous ode Sappho 31 V. well before Catullus 51.⁵⁹ Sympotic themes, as in the "comastic" Valerius Aedituus 2 Morel (= 2 Courtney) and bucolic topics, as in Porcius Licinus 6 Morel (= 7 Courtney) are also present.⁶⁰

3. *Did Catullus write epigrams?*

To summarize, aristocratic (and even politically conservative) Roman élites introduced a highly stylized epigram as a kind of *mode de salon*.

⁵⁷ On Catulus' reuse of Latin comic language, see Pascucci (1979); Tandoi (1981: 156–9); Perutelli (1990: 257–75); Maltby (1997); Biondi (1998a: 434–5); Morelli (2000: 164–77).

⁵⁸ Stark (1957: 330); Morelli (2000: 175–7).

⁵⁹ On the restoration of line 3, Courtney (1993: 70–1); Bernardi Perini (1997: 15–7); Nosarti (1999: 151–9); Morelli (2000: 186–9 and 340–1); Murgia (2002: 67).

⁶⁰ On Valerius Aedituus 2 Morel, see also Jocelyn (1994); on Porcius Licinus 6 Morel, Hubaux (1930: 23–6); Suerbaum (2002: 290–1), with further bibliography.

They imposed on it the ideology of a refined, exclusive society, taking as a prestigious model the literary culture of the aristocratic archaic Greek world while recasting it in the light of the Hellenistic epigram. No wonder then that such a literature became fashionable also for emerging figures or social classes: Cicero wrote at least one erotic epigram *à la Méléagre*, on kisses denied (cp. the later Catullus 99);⁶¹ and even at Pompeii the impressive cycle of Tiburtinus' epigrams on the outer wall of the Odeon shows the appeal that this new aristocratic taste exerted on provincial élites too.⁶²

The polymetric *nugae* and elegiac epigrams by Catullus and the *poetae novi* seem partly to continue, partly to break with such a Roman tradition.⁶³ Historical assessments have offered sometimes contradictory results. David O. Ross, for instance, states that Catullus' short poems in elegiacs follow a native Roman tradition (of which pre-neoteric epigram is an important part) with its own style and literary language,⁶⁴ and hence quite different from Hellenistic epigrams. On the other hand, Pierre Laurens argues that Catullus', Aedituus' and Porcius' poems are simply Hellenistic epigrams written in Latin; Catullus, by contrast, transformed generic expectations so radically that his short poems in elegiacs are scarcely epigrams, but rather short elegies, their composition and arrangement closer to sympotic Theognidean poetry; by comparison, the polymetric *nugae* are more akin to Greek epigram.⁶⁵ The following points respond to both these judgments.

1) Catullus augments pre-neoteric (and Meleagrian) classicism: the Greco-Roman epigram of Meleager's age was already affected by a strong tendency to re-evaluate the Callimachean model, and to approximate (through Callimachus) archaic Greek poetry.⁶⁶ Certainly we should not minimize the importance of Catullus' innovation, but must avoid the danger of placing it in a historical vacuum.

2) Catullus transformed the refined epigrammatic fashion of exclusive aristocratic groups into a consistent ideology of *venustas*—literary and

⁶¹ There is no reason to doubt the attribution to Cicero of Ep. 3 Soubiran; see Morelli (2000: 180–1).

⁶² Ross (1969: 147–9); Tandoi (1981) and (1982–3); Courtney (1993: 79–81); Morelli (2000: 237–57), with further bibliography.

⁶³ Recent general introduction to Catullan problems in Kolson Hurley (2004). See also Wiseman (1985) and Quinn (1999).

⁶⁴ Wheeler (1934: 61–86); Ross (1969: 137–69, esp. 145–6). Dominicy (2002) analyzes the rhetorical structure of c. 75, which he parallels with Valerius Aedituus 1 Morel.

⁶⁵ Laurens (1989: 177–8; 183–213).

⁶⁶ Granarolo (1978).

worldly refinement combined with bonds of love and affection set in a small social group—that clashes with the coarseness of the *invenusti*. Epigrams and *nugae* are a flexible literary instrument to express such ideals and to sketch the associated *démi-monde*.⁶⁷ To achieve this effect, Catullus displays in his short poems an impressive variety of literary forms and stylistic registers. Every poem is fashioned according to its own particular formula and shows a wide range of poetic features, with recourse to the most dissimilar generic traditions and linguistic registers.

3) In such a context, Theognidean poetry can be merely one ingredient of Catullus' elegiacs, not the key to understanding them. Limiting things to erotic topics, from a purely thematic and formal point of view, *c.* 70 is a Latin epigram in the style of Callimachus 11 GP (= *AP* 5.6 = 25 Pf.) or Meleager 69 GP (= *AP* 5.8), although the dramatic involvement of the *ego* is absent from its models. A mannerly poem such as *c.* 86 is inconceivable if we leave the *Garland* out of consideration. *Carmina* 83 and 92 work out, in Callimachean epigrammatic manner, the deductive reasoning of the *ego* about the behavior of his mistress,⁶⁸ and both include a rhetorically elaborated final point (83.6 *uritur et loquitur*; 92.2 and 4 *dispeream nisi amat... dispeream nisi amo*). From a purely generic point of view, what should we consider a small elegy like *c.* 99? Generic composition in Catullan erotic elegiacs is not limited to the contrast between Hellenistic epigram and Theognidean elegy.

4) The *topoi* and style of archaic Greek erotic lyric play an essential role not only in Catullus' *nugae*, but also in the epigrams. Anacr. 83 Page provides an important background for the famous *c.* 85 (*odi et amo*) even more than Theogn. 1091–4. Sappho 1 V., along with Theogn. 1323–6, inspired Catullus' prayer in *c.* 76. Although pre-neoteric poetry adapted Sapphic themes to epigram (cp. Valerius Aedituus 1), Catullus went further in his classicism, by, for instance, translating Sappho 31 V. into the same lyric meter (*c.* 51), which paved the way for Horace's more consistent literary experiment.

5) Nevertheless, Laurens is correct in drawing attention to the influence of archaic Greek "short elegy." Many of Catullus' poems in elegiacs are similar in shape, topic, and mood to Theognidean pieces. Moreover, Zicàri remarks that the Catullan distich in *cc.* 69–116 is,

⁶⁷ After Citroni (1995: 57–205), see now Nappa (2001: *passim*, esp. 9–34).

⁶⁸ Stoessl (1957: 291–4); Syndikus (1984–90: 3.49–52); Thomson (1997: 510–2).

in some metrical features, more similar to 'Theognis' than to Hellenistic epigrammatic elegiacs.⁶⁹ Above all, some important leitmotifs in the epigrammatic part of Catullus' *liber* have their background in Theognidean elegy. We may highlight the importance of the themes connected to *fides*, the loyalty between partners that in Catullus leads to a *foedus* (pact). Sometimes they are also shaped in a programmatic and paraenetic way (see *c.* 109). Nothing similar is to be found in the *nugae* (*cc.* 1–60): the generic difference between elegiacs and polymetrics is clearly marked. In Catullus' short elegiac poems distance between epigrams and erotic elegy is effaced: even in the Greek milieu there is evidence for poetry books containing both epigrams and elegies.⁷⁰ No wonder then that among Catullus' epigrams we find an elegy like *c.* 76, or that the subject matter and style of *c.* 68 and *cc.* 69–116 are so similar.⁷¹ This will have important effects on the history of Roman elegy: the only poems we know of Cornelius Gallus, the founding father of Roman elegy, are epigrams!⁷²

6) Catullus conceived of epigram as an open form. From a generic point of view, epigram was for him a literary frame in which he could combine features of very different poetic genres. And if we consider the rhetorical structure of many poems, we realize that it is not as "closed" as in Hellenistic epigram. Yet even in such cases, differences from Theognidean elegiac sketches are apparent: the epigrammatic taste for unity and symmetry is always present in Catullus (cp., e.g., the difference between Theogn. 1363–4 and *c.* 87). But more, Catullus' poems are open to thematic connections with other poems of the *liber*: for example, *c.* 87 grows richer in its meanings read together with *cc.* 75 and 85. As a whole, Catullus' *carmina* outline a consistent set of exemplary moments in the life of a poetic *ego* and afford a rare opportunity to observe the network of cross-references that marked out an ancient epigrammatic *libellus*.⁷³ In this, the anthology of Meleager represents

⁶⁹ Zicàri (1964), but see also the remarks in Morelli (2000: 307–13). On Catullan use of hiatus, see now Biondi (2003); on elision Dominicy (2002: 181–2). Ross (1969: 115–37) overemphasizes Roman features of Catullan elegiacs.

⁷⁰ Morelli (2000: 327).

⁷¹ Day (1938); Luck (1969: 59–69); Wiseman (1974: 77–103) and (1985); Pasoli (1980); Sarkissian (1983); Syndikus (1984–90: 2.296); Biondi (1998b: 473–6).

⁷² On the authenticity and literary background of Gallus' papyrus from Qasr Ibrim see, after Anderson, Parsons and Nisbet (1979), Capasso (2003).

⁷³ I think that Catullus' *Liber* was assembled by him or by an editor out of his milieu, shortly after his death: recent discussion and bibliography in Scherf (1996) and Morelli (2005). The *Liber* was perhaps articulated in three books (1–60; 61–64; 65–116): on

another major influence. In its erotic part, the *Garland* is organized into a sequence of thematic cores which can be read as a sort of exemplary erotic biography (falling in love, the madness and pain of love, subjection to the beloved, infidelities, separation and so on).⁷⁴

7) In addition to erotic topics, we find in the *Liber* other traditional epigrammatic motifs:⁷⁵ funerary themes (*cc.* 96 and 101; see also 65 and 68; not coincidentally, such topics are absent in the polymetric section)⁷⁶ and literary manifestos and polemics (95 and 116; see 1, 16, 22, 35, 36, 50 in the *nugae*). Above all, we find abundant invective, in both the elegiacs and lyrics. The influence of Hellenistic epigram is evident, for instance, in the frequent mixture of *ad hominem* attacks and literary questions (16, 22, 36, 95, 105, 116),⁷⁷ but Catullus' themes and language are often very different and extreme. His aggressive *ἰαμβικὴ ἰδέα* gives an epigrammatic form to the archaic "Ionic" violence of Archilochus' and Hipponax' poetry,⁷⁸ a further example of Catullus' classicism, which, once again, consists not of bookish or frigid imitation, but of the topical presentation of literary models. At the same time, however, contemporary Roman culture is fond of satiric verse attacks. Indeed, while the similarity between Catullus' satiric poems and Calvus' epigrammatic onslaughts on Caesar and Pompeius (17–8 Morel = 17–8 Courtney) is impressive, Calvus' scraps are only part of a quite large corpus of contemporary poetic fragments (both anonymous or by a recognized author) and *testimonia*. Short satiric poems were a Roman tradition (*fescennina iocatio*, *occentatio*, *carmina triumphalia*),⁷⁹ largely reused by literary epigram and political propaganda: in cultivated poetry as in folkloric verse or versified slogans, sexual, scatological, and obscene language and topics are often prominent (Calvus 17–8 Morel; *vers. pop.* in *Caes.* 1–2 and 7 Morel = *vers. triumph.* 1–2 and *vers. pop.* 3 Courtney).

the third one, see now Skinner (2003). On thematic and word connections in Catullus' work, see now Claes (1996) and (2002).

⁷⁴ See Gutzwiller in this volume.

⁷⁵ On the poetics of the various topics in Catullus and Greek epigram, see recently Hutchinson (2003).

⁷⁶ The elegiac fragments of Calvus (15–6 Morel = 15–6 Courtney) are interesting: they possibly derive from a poem in memory of Calvus' wife Quintilia. On Calvus, Bardon (1952: 1.341–4); Granarolo (1973: 343–8); Perutelli (1988); Courtney (1993: 201–11), with further bibliography.

⁷⁷ See now Davies (2000); Schievenin (2000). More in general Gamberale (1982).

⁷⁸ Newman (1990: 43–74). On Catullus' obscene language see Richlin (1981) and Fitzgerald (1995: 59–86), with further bibliography.

⁷⁹ Fraenkel (1955) and (1961). On relationships with Roman folklore, see now Di Benedetto (2001).

8) We return to the role of the Roman poetic tradition in Catullus. The range of linguistic registers in Catullus' short poems is greater than in Meleager's or Callimachus' epigrams. He follows pre-neoteric epigram in recuperating many linguistic features of the ancient *palliat*a. Catullus' language meets and, at the same time, goes beyond the quasi-Callimachean demands of realism. The violence of his αἰσχρολογία suits the coarseness of his targets, but even in outlining such disgusting figures as Aemilius (c. 97) or Victus (c. 98), Catullus does not lose control of the epigrammatic shape. One example, c. 80, suffices:

*Quid dicam, Gelli, quare rosea ista labella
Hiberna fiant candidiora nive,
mane domo cum exis et cum te octava quiete
e molli longo suscitatur hora die?
Nescio quid certe est. An vere fama susurrat
grandia te mediū tenta vorare viri?
Sic certe est: clamant Victoris rupta miselli
ilia et emulso labra notata sero.*

What am I to say, Gellius, to explain why those rosy lips grow whiter than winter snow when you leave the house in the morning and when the eighth hour wakes you from your soft slumber in the long day? Something is certainly going on. Or is the rumour true which whispers that you swallow the massive stretchings at a man's middle? That must be how it is. Poor Victor's shattered groin shouts it and your lips stained with the white liquid that you have milked. (trans. Godwin)

The attack on Gellius is crude, but the structure of the poem carefully worked out. It parodies a famous Callimachean scenario wherein the *ego* gradually detects the falling in love of a companion (13 GP = AP 12.134 = 43 Pf.) or even of his own soul (4 GP, the poem imitated by Catullus). The rhetoric of Catullus' poem is similar (1, *quid dicam?*; 5, *nescio quid certe est. An vera*; 7, *sic certe est*, see Catullus 1.1–2 Courtney, *credo... sic est*), but it anticipates a very different final point. Another humorous reworking of the same *topos* is to be found in the *nugae* (c. 6). In c. 80.1–2 and 8 the snow-white lips of Gellius hint at another well-known erotic topic: the *pallor amantis*. The obscene *sero* properly signifies “whey,” yet its slang meaning “sperm” contrasts with the high register of the first lines (2, *hiberna... candidiora nive*).⁸⁰ Such clashes in linguistic register form part and parcel of Catullus' dramatic, or expressionistic style, by which he surpasses the playfulness of both Plautus and

⁸⁰ Curran (1966); Syndikus (1984–90: 3.40–3); Thomson (1997: 507–8); Godwin (1999: 196).

pre-neoteric epigram.⁸¹ The innovative language fits the new Catullan mood, which is dominated by a fascinating collision between ideals and hard reality, refinement and roughness, loyalty and infidelity.

9) What then of the polymetric *nugae*? Many of them develop purely epigrammatic themes (*cc.* 2–3, Lesbia’s sparrow; 13, the invitation to dinner; 26, Catullus’ *villula*; 41 and 43, the high claims of a hetaera), but the variety of poetic forms, as well as the relatively large average size of the poems, raises questions.⁸² Hellenistic epigram entered Rome as part of a larger set of light poetic genres of uncertain status. Names and titles such as *ludicra*, *nugae*, and *paegnia* often recur in Catullus’ age; *epigrammata*, *hendecasyllabi*, and *poematia* are some terms still used by Pliny the Younger (*Ep.* 4.14.9) to define the varieties of lyric and epigram produced in his time.⁸³ Literary fashion in high society also involved short poems in lyric meters on topics found in contemporary epigram (Laevius fr. 28 Morel = 28 Courtney is the *incipit* of a love letter, in the style of Tiburtinus’ *CIL* 4.4971 and Catullus *c.* 32). Occasional poems in lyric meter were surely frequent: amateur aristocratic circles appreciated Antipater’s metrical versatility and cleverness in improvisation (Cic. *De or.* 3.194). Catullus’ *nugae* must be seen in this historical context wherein Calvus and other *neoteroi* also produced similar poems in lyric meter, with a noteworthy preference for the Phalaecian. With Catullus, a salon fashion becomes high literary art that revisits Greek poetic tradition *in toto*, both lyric and epigrammatic.

10) It makes no sense to ask whether each and every one of Catullus’ short poems is an epigram. To be sure, *cc.* 69–116 can be defined, as a whole, as an epigrammatic collection, even though some fit Hellenistic epigrammatic canons less well than the others. Contemporary Roman use of the word *epigramma* is also noteworthy. For instance, Varro (*Ling. Lat.* 7.28) calls a scoptic poem in elegiacs by one Papinius, not different from many of Catullus’ aggressive poems, an *epigrammation*. Generic borders between epigram and elegy or light lyric poetry were vague. This sheds light on the Roman approach to epigram and the cultural background for collections like the *Catalepton*, where poems of various sizes and meters alternate,⁸⁴ and Martial’s polymetrics and *epigrammata longa*. Is this purely a Roman peculiarity? Or did the Meleagrian “canon”

⁸¹ Newman (1990: esp. 277–317); Biondi (1998b: 464–8).

⁸² Carilli (1975); Fuhrer (1994).

⁸³ Citroni (2003b).

⁸⁴ Holzberg (2004).

cover, in the Greek milieu, a wider range of epigrammatic forms? It would be a mistake to suppose that there were original Greek models for each and every one of Catullus' generic experiments: we must not neglect the specificity of his Roman culture or personal genius. On the other hand, as we have seen, it is clear that Romans selected from Hellenistic poetry those features found more suitable for their own culture; vice versa, Greek poets in Rome complied with the literary taste of their patrons, as the example of Antipater demonstrates.

ROMAN IMPERIAL RECEPTIONS OF HELLENISTIC EPIGRAM

Gideon Nisbet

For the classicist in a hurry, the Roman world's reception of Hellenistic epigram would seem a story easily and quickly told. A century of modern scholarship, often of very high quality, has compiled and glossed an eminently tractable canon of inscriptional and literary epigrams which appears tailor-made for just this aim—complete with helpfully recent finds to add the all-important note of topicality. If one were cynically inclined, a serviceable and colorful narrative of Rome's receptions of epigram could be thrown together overnight simply by gluing these texts and exegeses end to end. At the level of methodology, too, and of critical judgment, an implicit scholarly consensus emerges so straightforwardly from the literature that one might expect the present chapter to write itself. And to a limited extent it does just that; like so many attempts at reappraisal, the chapter rehearses and underscores the very status quo it attempts to disturb. Predictably, my narrative revisits a number of old favorites which have become clichés in the modern treatments—Greek gurus as garden ornaments, Emperors moonlighting as epigrammatists, female tourists with literary pretensions, picturesque Romantic colossi. Where I hope to differ, and to contribute added value, is in doing so *reflexively*, reappraising and critiquing the handful of totemic exhibits upon which this too-convenient narrative leans so heavily.

One of the ideas towards which I work emerges fairly straightforwardly as an end-point to the primary narrative. Epigram both enables and interestingly complicates the articulation of cultural and personal identities between, across, and against “Greece” and “Rome”—sometimes all three at once. This is, I think, a useful idea with plenty of mileage in it. These themes of self-fashioning and cultural frames feed off—but are also compromised by—larger and more self-consciously leftfield concerns about layers of reception. Can an account—any account—of epigram in the Roman world assert critical elbow room against a century (and more) of scholarly and popular versions? Modern receptions of epigram claim a chapter of this volume in their own

right;¹ but they also turn out to be crucial as we tease apart the accepted Roman narrative. *Why* the tractable canon, the romantic clichés, the uniformity of critical tone? This is a story not just of reception, but of reception of reception (of ...). Narrating Rome's love affair with Hellenistic epigram in ways that go beyond the obvious entails a reflexive engagement with our own positionality as contemporary students and readers of epigram. What agendas are we, knowingly or otherwise, bringing with us to the text?

I begin with a severely abbreviated version of what this chapter could all too easily have been—the cut-and-paste consensus that emerges so suspiciously smoothly from the scholarship on epigram. I then move on to problematize it, reading the consensus account against the grain to reveal its faultlines and significant silences. I revisit some of the usual suspects—gurus, Emperors, tourists, *colossi*—from what I hope will be a new and rewarding perspective, engaging critically with their modern scholarly reception and teasing out an unexpected complex of mixed-vintage agendas.

1. *Roman receptions of epigram: an overview*

This brief introductory account is, by design, both selective and unoriginal—for reasons which I hope my opening remarks will have made clear (usual suspects, implicit consensus). Its purpose is twofold: to build initial context for the chapter's more interesting moments later on, and to provide a non-controversial set of pointers towards fuller scholarly resources for a reader coming fresh to the topic.

Latin literature's initial engagement with Hellenistic epigram comes surprisingly early, notably via Ennius, but is sporadic and tentative. To complicate things somewhat from the outset, we can trace a minor and rudimentary but insistently self-sufficient indigenous tradition of short inscriptional verse (primarily funerary, and initially in the local meter of Saturnians) which resembles epigram.² Things become more interesting from our point of view as Rome develops a familiarity with the legacy of Hellenistic epigram via imported experts (e.g., Archias, Philodemus) and

¹ See Haynes in this volume.

² Mario Citroni's invaluable *OCD*³ article, "Epigram, Latin," is particularly useful on these early developments; and see Morelli in this volume.

convenient compilations (e.g., the canon-forming *Garland* of Meleager) in the first century B.C. A few well-connected patrons of Greek culture (e.g., Lutatius Catulus) begin to write Greek epigrams of their own in straightforward imitation of the important Hellenistic authors; modern criticism has been harsh on these fledgling efforts.³ Hellenistic models assume centrality for subsequent Latin epigram; Catullus explicitly and repeatedly invokes a Callimachean poetics for his *uersiculi*. Although Catullus never explicitly calls his poems “epigrams,” the terminology had clearly crossed over; our first datable Latin use of *epigramma* is in a speech of Cicero (*Pro Arch.* 25).

Greek epigram itself continues to undergo change and/or decline, in ways that begin to take it beyond the scope both of this volume (“Hellenistic Epigram”) and, on balance, of the present chapter (“Roman Receptions”)—although many modern critics deduce a Roman influence in what they see as the progressive coarsening of the genre’s themes. A century or more down the line, Martial imitates the contemporary Greek skoptic epigrammatists, flippantly relegating the Hellenistic greats to footnote status as he shores up his Latin literary pedigree (as, e.g., at Martial 4.23, where Callimachus is placed second to local straw man “Bruttianus”). But Martial’s chauvinist modernism is a blip; the philhellene Emperors Trajan and Hadrian write epigrams in Greek, with Hadrian in particular going out of his way to advertise his respect for the genre’s back-story.⁴ Their contemporaries, too, continue to demonstrate a familiar imitative poetics in the epigrams they inscribe on the truncated Colossus of Memnon at Egyptian Thebes. Élite female tourists in particular find inscriptional epigram in exotic locales a congenial and socially safe literary exercise which advertises their learning and offers possibilities for subjective self-expression.

This account of epigram in Roman reception is abbreviated practically to the point of pastiche. Nonetheless, the story it rehearses will read as old news to students in the field; it strings together (and cynically traduces) a coherent array of scholarly treatments and positions. When it comes to Roman receptions of epigram, this species of derivative overview practically writes itself, and one of the purposes

³ See e.g. Cameron (1993: 92) for brusque aesthetic write-offs of Catulus, Aedituus and Licinus. Greeks imitate, Romans merely copy. One incidental aim of this chapter is to unpack the implicit rationale of this interpretative double standard.

⁴ Trajan as Greek epigrammatist: Nisbet (2003a: 196–7). Hadrian and Greek poetry: Bowie (1990a), Nisbet (2003a: 193).

of this chapter is to ask why. Even at the outset, though, this breezily lacunose recapitulation of what we think we know about Roman receptions invites against-the-grain readings. Perhaps most obvious to readers of the Greek epigrammatic tradition is the “Roman” contamination implicitly invoked—or (as we will see), just as frequently, explicitly articulated—by narratives of the genre’s purported decline from a Hellenistic peak. I would suggest that our picture of Imperial Greek epigram has undergone serious distortion as a result; certainly Rome’s agenda pushes the genre around in all the best published discussions.⁵ Similarly, Martial’s self-fashioning within genre is far more problematic than the dedicated scholarship has wanted to acknowledge, and naïve readings of Martial have been every bit as detrimental to our understanding of epigram in Roman reception as they have to our readings of post-Hellenistic Greek epigram. I suggest some further leads on both of these underlying (and inextricably interwoven) concerns in my essay on satiric epigram in this volume.

Instead I begin by a brief flirtation with Martial’s declared model, Catullus. I then move on to a more detailed engagement with two types of Roman reader-*cum*-writer of Greek epigram, foregrounded by modern scholarship: philhellene Emperors, and female tourists.

2. “Sadder than Simonidean tears”: Catullus and Roman responses to epigram

Catullus is fundamental to the modern consensus on Roman receptions of Hellenistic epigram. But his role within this story must remain both provisional and problematic—doubly so given the crushingly heavy foundational burden imposed on the Catullan corpus by a self-promoting and perhaps comically disingenuous Martial, a century and more down the line. Catullus not only writes what we would call epigram, and certainly with Hellenistic models in mind; he is undeniably an *epigrammatist* (among other things), a habitual and accomplished writer within the genre, and most probably a publisher of epigram in book form. Appropriately, his wider frame of literary reference is aggressively Hellenistic. His friends write (or fail to write) intricate *epyllia* in a studied Callimachean vein (*Carmen* 95), and Catullus’ own longer poems

⁵ E.g., the excellent Bowie (1990a) pushes hard to open up the debate via as diverse a range of verse texts as he can throw at us—but dates Strato’s homoerotic epigrams by finding him a gay-friendly Emperor to write under (1990a: 57).

beg to be categorized as more of the same. His allusions can also be pointedly Callimachean (e.g., *Carmen* 7), and never more so than in his epigrams.⁶ *Carmen* 70, for instance, invokes a reader who will pick up on detailed allusion to Callimachus GP 11 (= 25 Pf. = *AP* 5.6): e.g., νύμφης—*nubere*. In particular, repetition-of-repetition (ῥμοσε...ῥμοσε transposed as *dicīt...dicīt*) cues up Catullus' radical rewrite of Callimachus' text as Roman autobiography:

*Nulli se dicīt mulier mea nubere malle
quam mihi, non si se Iuppiter ipse petat.
dicīt: sed mulier cupido quod dicīt amanti,
in uento et rapida scribere oportet aqua.*

My woman said that she would never choose to marry another over me, not if Jupiter himself were her suitor. She said so: but what a woman says to a lovestruck lover ought to be written on the wind and the swift-flowing water.

ῥμοσε Καλλίγνωτος Ἴωνίδι μήποτ' ἐκείνης
ἔξειν μήτε φίλον κρέσσονα μήτε φίλην·
ῥμοσε· ἀλλὰ λέγουσιν ἀληθέα τοὺς ἐν ἔρωτι
ὄρκους μὴ δύνειν οὔατ' ἐς ἀθανάτων.
νύν δ' ὁ μὲν ἀρσενικῷ θέρεται πυρί, τῆς δε παλαίης
νύμφης ὡς Μεγαρέων οὐ λόγος οὐδ' ἀριθμός.

Callignotus swore to Ionis that he would never prefer another to her, whether boy or girl. He swore: but they say truly that oaths concerning love are without force in the ears of the immortals. Now he is singed by a boyish fire; and of his former union, as of the Megarians' [tears], there is no account or reckoning.

However, Catullus never refers to his short poems or those of his friends as “epigrams.” His preferred term for his own short verse is the Latin *uersiculi*, and his aggressively obscene *ad hominem* political themes are consistently (perhaps insistently) home-grown. At times the silence is, perhaps deliberately, awkward. Catullus ostentatiously fudges the genre issue in a poem (epigram?) addressed to Cornificius, naming-but-not-naming their shared genre via a flattering literary scenario of resourceful Roman improvisation punching above its weight in a tag-team bout with Greek epigram's totemic *protos heurētes*:⁷

⁶ Fitzgerald (1995: 46–9) is suggestive on Catullus *Carmen* 15 and Callimachus GP 11 (= 28 Pf.); cf. Fitzgerald (1995: 189–91) on Catullus' complex use of Callimachean allusion.

⁷ A further level of fascinating complication suggested by one of this chapter's anonymous readers that it is predominantly *Roman* literary culture that fashions Simonides as

*paulum quid lubet allocutionis,
maestius lacrimis Simonideis.*

(*Carmen* 38.7–8)

...whatever scrap of speech appeals—something sadder than Simonidean tears.

My concern in this brief discussion is not the extent of Catullus' actual engagement with Hellenistic epigram (whatever that may have been—the topic remains under-studied)⁸ but the pose he strikes, the literary game he enjoys with his model reader. Across the surviving corpus, Catullus plays off dissonant cultural frames against one another, in a perhaps ironic bid to have it both ways—ultra-Hellenistic poet of sad sensibility *and* foul-mouthed Roman lad-about-town. All too often, of course, the dissonance is read as straight biography, in large part via semi-scholarly and popular receptions driven by the educational marketplace—conflicted, “tender” Catullus as sixth-form staple. These naïve receptions of Catullus are easily deconstructed.⁹ More to my point, they also stand as an object lesson in the perils of reading Latin epigram either as a straightforward copy of or a reaction against Hellenistic models—and certainly of believing what Latin epigrammatists themselves might say about it. Martial in particular is too often still read for metapoetic transparency. (In fact, he is routinely read for transparency on any number of levels—from arena spectacles to Rome's urban topography.) His recruitment of Catullus as generic figurehead, though, opens up more awkward questions than it closes down—perhaps (in line with his model) deliberately, and for fun. Across his whole vast corpus, Martial painstakingly establishes himself as an untrustworthy narrator, never more so than when talking about his own literary practices, rivals, models and theories. Catullus' genre coyly refuses to speak its name; Martial's refuses to shut up for a moment; both are, in some sense at least, satirical constructs.

Catullus points towards wider patterns of response among contemporaries who are coming to terms with Hellenistic epigram on a large scale for the first time in Latin literary culture. Cicero's use of *epigramma* in his speech *Pro Archia* (25) naturalizes the terminology and renders it

the quintessential Greek epigrammatist. Fitzgerald (1995: 119–20) is usefully provocative on agenda-driven Catullan “misapplication” of terminologies.

⁸ See Morelli (2000) and Morelli's chapter in the present volume.

⁹ For a merciless dissection of this style of modern reception see Wiseman (1985)'s closing chapter.

demotic: any “bad poet of the common people” (*malus poeta de populo*) can write a *libellus* filled with *epigrammata*. Simultaneously, and pointedly, Cicero sets Rome’s encounter with epigram against a backdrop of appropriations of Hellenistic *paideia* via high-profile imported intellectuals. Home-grown *epigrammata* are all very well, but any Republican statesman with a concern for public image would jump at the chance of associating himself with the good Greek stuff:

Qui sedulitatem mali poetae duxerit aliquo tamen praemio dignam, huius ingenium et virtutem in scribendo et copiam non expetisset?

[Sulla] considered the industry of a bad poet worth of at least some reward; don’t you think he would have made a beeline for someone of Archias’ intellect, literary gifts and productivity?”

An important case in point is Philodemus of Gadara. Philodemus, an Epicurean philosopher, literary critic and former hostage patronized by Piso, became an important communicator of Hellenistic literary culture to Roman poets in the early first century B.C., alongside figures like Parthenius and Cicero’s friend Archias; he also wrote epigrams, which survive via the *GA*. A thoughtful and detailed recent commentary by David Sider enthusiastically pursues an epigrammatist located precisely in geographical and cultural space by cross-referencing to Philodemus’ own newly available philosophical and literary-critical works, buried by Vesuvius’ A.D. 79 eruption in the library of the Villa dei Papiri at Herculaneum.¹⁰ Although aspects of this biographically rich update might be questioned, Sider’s emphasis on Philodemus’ presence at Herculaneum as a crucial enabler of Latin poetics is very much to the point of the present essay—he influences Virgil, Varius and perhaps Horace.¹¹ But these poets are not epigrammatists; and Philodemus’ own surviving epigrams, deferentially allusive to the recognized Hellenistic greats,¹² do not themselves find imitators. Recent scholarship traces the metamorphoses of Greek epigram into strange and surprising new forms as it diffuses into Roman literary culture. For example, the deaths of minor characters in Virgil’s *Aeneid* may be read against the narrative

¹⁰ Their ongoing decipherment is increasingly supported by contemporary imaging technologies. For a lively account of the Villa and its papyri see Gigante (1995).

¹¹ Sider (1997: 18–24) rightly stresses the huge importance of Philodemus as a catalyst for a wide range of Latin poetic innovations.

¹² See Sider (1997: 24–5) on Philodemus’ indebtedness to Meleager, Asclepiades and Callimachus.

codes of Hellenistic epigram—the last place we might have thought to look for it.¹³ And against the new Posidippus, Propertius 3.7 comes out as an innovative mimesis of an entire thematic category from a Hellenistic book, drawing out much wider implications for the study of Augustan poetry generally.¹⁴ These critical interventions deserve to enliven their respective fields; at the same time, they leave reception studies in epigram looking perilously open-ended. Breezy, gap-skipping grand narratives ultimately don't help us get to grips with Imperial receptions of epigram; instead we need to emphasize the particular, the local.

3. *Trajan's nose tells the time: receptions of epigram, representations of power*

Ἀντίον ἡελίου στήσας ῥίνα καὶ στόμα χάσκων
δείξει τὰς ὥρας πᾶσι παρερχομένοις.

(*AP* 11.418 = Trajan *FGE* 1)

If you point your nose at the sun and say “Ah,” you'll show the time of day to everyone passing by.

This epigram from the eleventh Book of the *GA* is a straightforward but effective variant on a skoptic type popularized by the mid-first century A.D. epigrammatist Nicarchus; as so often with these epigrams, it pokes fun at physical difference. The addressee's nose is so big that he would make a good sundial—his nose is the gnomon, his mouth, the dial (the teeth mark off the hours). There is a minor problem in the scansion of the author's Greek—the *í* in *ῥίνα* is short where it should really be long—but this does not account for the inordinate degree of interest which has accrued to the epigram over the years; primarily in modern scholarship, but also via translation and imitation.¹⁵ Instead, the poem finds itself repeatedly cited and critiqued because of the authorship alleged by the *GA*'s paratext—“The Emperor Trajan.”

As far as we can tell, the *GA*'s ascriptions are surprisingly reliable on the whole; but Trajan's poem is an obvious one-off, and it is perhaps indicative of wider interpretative tendencies that its attribution to him

¹³ Dinter (2005), building on Thomas' important treatment (1998); see also Bruss (2005a).

¹⁴ Thomas (2004).

¹⁵ On versions and scholarly appraisals (particularly the fuss over Trajan's scansion) see Nisbet (2003a: 196–7), with further bibliography.

is generally taken at face value. (Trajan's own received persona as military and utilitarian over-achiever might supply the biographically inclined with trivially persuasive grounds for doubt.)¹⁶ Instead, the hand of Caesar has been taken for granted. Trajan's chosen successor Hadrian conveniently lends plausibility to the traditional ascription by retrospective association; a number of epigrams attach to him fairly securely. These too, unsurprisingly, have been repeatedly and usefully discussed in the published scholarship; we will touch on them shortly. Why, though, does Trajan-as-epigrammatist—about as “minor” an author as one can imagine, and even perhaps “sub-literary”—continue to pique the interest of the academy?

In part, our responses to Trajan's epigram follow the prompting (knowingly or otherwise) of two linked Roman political and historiographic discourses with which he himself would have been quite familiar—and which he surely has in mind as he writes (*if* he writes). The first is the Republican elite tradition of irreverent light verse—a tradition which also of course bulks large in Catullus' literary genealogy. A sense of humor and cheerful endurance of invective demonstrated, among other things, an absence of tyrannical inclinations. An ambitious Roman patrician could look forward to his soldiers singing insinuating ditties at his triumph; the occasion would not be complete, or for that matter ideologically safe, without this foul-mouthed and impeccably demotic counterpoint to the stage-whispered “Remember thou art mortal.” Read (simplistically) against this scheme, Catullus' edgy political invectives end up as more of the same old thing—mucky songs for Caesar's triumphs. Cicero explicitly merges epigram into this ideological frame at *Pro Archia* 25. His Sulla, put on the spot as the very public target of a book of satirical epigrams, turns the moment around by showering largesse on the “bad poet of the common people.”

This ability of satirical light verse-*cum*-“epigram” to mystify autocratic power carries over into the Empire, this time in epigrams *by* Emperors which (then as now) complicate our readings of the genre even as they raise its profile. Epigrams *about* Emperors, conversely, end up being read (then as now) as edgy and oppositional. In Suetonius, street-level invective becomes an indicator of tyrannical character,

¹⁶ Page (1981: 561) reports dissenting views, but maintains a sunny positivism (556): “It is not elsewhere recorded that Trajan did this sort of thing, and it seems out of character; but the sceptic must be asked to explain how it came to pass that the *Anthology* says that he wrote the epigram if he did not.”

not a guarantor against it, and Greek skoptic epigram becomes the paradigmatic whistle-blowing genre. Suetonius singles out an example with a punchline inseparable from Greek arithmetic, in which letters of the alphabet represent numbers; adding up the five Greek letters of Nero's name creates a mathematical riddle very like the habitual isopsephy of the Greek epigrammatist Leonides.¹⁷ Suetonius rhetorically underscores the form's squarely Hellenic frame of reference (and cues up "Greece" as an implicit shorthand for risk-taking free speech against the mighty) even as he slots it into a characteristically Roman narrative logic (*Nero* 39):

... multa Graece Latineque proscripta aut vulgata sunt, sicut illa:

Νέρων Ὀρέστης Ἀλκμέων μητροκτόνος·
νεόψηφον· Νέρων ἰδίαν μητέρα ἀπέκτεινε.

There was plenty of samizdat and street-level publication in Greek and Latin alike. Stuff like: "Nero, Orestes, Alkmaeon: every one a matricide. Do the math: 'Nero' = 'killed his own mother.'"

Circling back around to Trajan's epigram, then, we see its author (*if*..., etc.) using an Imperial Greek variant on an essentially Hellenistic genre to position himself within a Roman political discourse, with an eye too for the *longue durée* via write-ups in a Suetonian idiom. If his too-long Nicarchan nose is simultaneously too short—out of joint with itself, metrically speaking—that is because it is also, and incompatibly, a *Roman* nose.

The modern scholarly discourse on epigram by Emperors downplays Trajan's intriguing effect of jarring superimposition via dismissive lit.-crit., with textual critics jumping at the chance to play Imperial adviser: "somebody should have warned the emperor Trajan against ρίνα."¹⁸ Skoptic, scansion-mangling Trajan becomes a "bad" Emperor in contrast to "good" Hadrian, the genre-respectful Parthenius fan. One implicit frame of reference here is a wider and essentially Victorian discourse of literary value in epigram. Earliest is incontestably best; change is decline; contact with Rome's syphilitic sensuality contaminates and coarsens the genre, corrupting epigram from an original Hellenic

¹⁷ For an accessible account of Greek epigrammatists' fondness for jokes and riddles based on arithmetic using the Greek alphabet (alpha = 1, beta = 2, etc.—omega of course counts very high), see Page (1981: 508–10); subsequently, Nisbet (2003a: 202–8).

¹⁸ This particular formulation is from Page (1978: 42).

innocence.¹⁹ This pious teleology pushed all the right buttons within a long-gone ideological moment—a soft-focus fever-dream of Hellas as Europe’s Childhood, which in cosy retrospect at least works only as comic relief. The old insistence on reading any and all sexuality as Roman contamination entailed a now unworkable quantity of willed doublethink, to say nothing of some egregious misdating. (Rufinus is a case in point—demoted from first to fourth century A.D. for his dirty mouth.)²⁰ Nonetheless, critical assumptions spun off from this specious grand narrative still inflect our model of Greek epigram under Rome; we still go looking for decline and tut when we (unsurprisingly) see it. Epigrams by *or* about Emperors end up in a critical double bind, caught between irreconcilable but mutually reinforcing agendas: the condescension and low expectations of literary scholars (we are pleasantly surprised when Hadrian turns out to be highly competent) on the one hand and, on the other, turf-grabs by two millennia of career Imperial historiographers keen to recuperate the texts as “documents illustrating the reign of...”

Even a “good” epigrammatic Emperor can work mischief with the system, though. Hadrian’s career as an accomplished amateur poet is well documented and (patronizingly) discussed in the literature; his epigrams in Greek include a dedicatory epigram which he had inscribed on the tomb of the Hellenistic poet Parthenius, the restoration of which he oversaw. The text (Hadrian 7 *FGE*), imperfectly known via a botched transcript, fine-tunes the Emperor’s image as Hellenophile by parading his informed appreciation of an important Hellenistic author who by Hadrian’s time had lapsed into relative obscurity. Parthenius had been a crucial conduit of Hellenistic learning and poetics into Roman literary culture. He came to Rome as Cornelius Gallus’ war booty; was Virgil’s tutor in Greek, the author of a *Metamorphoses*, and the compiler for Gallus of a prose handbook of themes for erotic elegy culled from recondite Hellenistic epic, *Erotika Pathemata*. Hadrian’s Hellenophilia, then, keeps Greece in its proper place. Hadrian’s other

¹⁹ Predictably perhaps, John Addington Symonds’ rhetoric on Rome’s sexual infection of Greek epigram is revealingly overwrought. Symonds (1893: 2.33, 2.314 and esp. 2.320–5). On Symonds, see my essay on satiric epigram in this volume.

²⁰ Bowie (1990a: 56) sums up the scholarly debate on Rufinus’ date. Sex = degeneracy = lateness. See Symonds (1893: 2.325): “a man need be neither a prude nor a Puritan to turn with sadness and with loathing from these last autumnal blossoms on the tree of Greek beauty. The brothel and the grave are all that is left for Rufinus and his contemporaries.”

epigrams include a dedicatory poem from Thespieae (Hadrian 5 *FGE*), written in hendecasyllables—intriguingly uncommon as a Greek meter (and hence a suitable advertisement of their author’s profound Greek learning), but also of course the characteristic meter of Catullus. The Thespieae epigram invokes and teases a culturally mobile (if not outright fence-sitting) model reader, dramatizing an unspeakable slippage between literary systems. Hadrian strikes a pose as Grecker than the Greeks in his cultivation of rare poetic forms and knowledge of local cult, but ironically invites us to read in the possibility that he is just another aristocratic Roman hack, throwing his weight around and “improving” a genre to death. And plugging his imperial autobiography: whether it is the “right” bear or not, the Emperor’s foundation of Hadrianoutherae becomes an inescapable material intertext for the epigram’s subsequent reception:²¹

ὦ παῖ τοξότα Κύπριδος λιγείης
 Θεσπιαῖς Ἑλικωνίασι ναίων
 Ναρκίσσου παρὰ κῆπον ἀνθέοντα,
 ἰλήκοις· τὸ δέ τοι δίδωσι δέξο
 ἀκροθίνιον Ἀδριανὸς ἄρκτου,
 ἦν αὐτὸς κάθεν ἰππόθεν τυχίσας.
 σὺ δ’ αὐτῷ χάριν ἀντὶ τοῦ σαόφρων
 πνέοις οὐρανίας ἀπ’ Ἀφροδίτης.

Archer child of clear-voiced Aphrodite, you who dwell in Heliconian Thespieae beside Narcissus’ flowery meadow: may you be propitious. Receive the spoils which Hadrian gives you from the bear which he himself killed when he encountered it while riding. In exchange for which may you modestly breathe favor upon him from heavenly Aphrodite.

And Hadrian’s pithy Latin come-back to a not-quite-epigram by big-time whiner Annius Florus (*Historia Augusta* 16.3–4 = Hadrian 1 *FLP*, Florus 1 *FLP*) is old-style patrician light verse to a tee—just what the spin-doctor ordered to differentiate Hadrian’s “good” philhellenism from Nero’s “bad” version, and written very much with an eye to the soap-biographical tradition which so obligingly reports it for us (and, so, “for” him).

²¹ Page (1981: 566) on Hadrian’s linguistic refinement (e.g., λιγείης, 1; σαόφρων, 7; and cf. also the rare verb καίνω, 6), subtle Homeric coloring (ἰππόθεν, 6) and detailed knowledge of local religious history (Θεσπιαῖς, 2; Ναρκίσσου, 3); in passing, also (1981: 565) on Hadrian’s Mysian foundation of Hadrianoutherae. For a more cautious response to the Thespieae poem see, again, Bowie (1990a: 61).

4. *Songs of Balbilitis: female tourists and elegiac subjectivity*

A winning combination of ancient political ideology and modern historiographic convenience lets Emperors lord it over our agreed picture of Roman receptions of literary epigram (Trajan's joke isn't all *that* good...). When we turn to inscriptional epigram, we see a far more drastic selectivity—or, rather, we don't. The Roman era was inscriptional epigram's golden age, generating far more individual texts than any earlier period, but there is still no satisfactory corpus for the Greek material in particular—not despite, but because of, the sheer volume of material. Prospective editors have prudently backed away from the challenge.

The paradoxical result is that, for modern scholarly and popular purposes, with a few honorable exceptions, Roman-era inscriptional epigram might as well not exist outside of a few square meters of statue-base and lower leg—the truncated remains of the Colossus of Memnon at Egyptian Thebes. Two centuries of ancient visitors—élite tourists, military officers, provincial bureaucrats—arranged for their compositions to be incised on the accessible areas of the seated limestone statue of a long-dead Pharaoh (in actuality Amenhotep III), identified variously in the Roman era as “Memnon,” “Phamenoth” and “Sesostris” (the latter two only in later poems); the modern era's love-affair with Egyptian exoticism has fine-tuned the statue's Romantic pathos (“Look on my works...”). Latterly, a reliable and complete corpus of the Memnon “graffiti”—a microcosm of exactly what we do not have for the wider Mediterranean context—has supported a seemingly interminable succession of scholarly and popular treatments.²² Each re-telling adds a further layer of noise and nuance to Memnon's ongoing narrative, incrementally and spuriously rewriting him as the stand-alone embodiment of inscriptional epigram under the Empire generally. (The Memnon texts aren't *that* unusual....)

Even here, the critics are selective. Prominent in published discussions of the Memnon graffiti are epigrams by female visitors.²³ In particular, four poems by Julia Balbilla have inspired intelligent and

²² Among others: Bowersock (1984), Lindsay (1968: 315–27). The corpus of Memnon epigrams: Bernand and Bernand (1960).

²³ E.g., Bowie (1990a: 61–4), Brennan (1998); with a strikingly complementary emphasis, Speller (2002: 131–50), who structures her semi-scholarly Memnon-narrative around Balbilla's fictional diary.

sensitive discussion which nonetheless points towards a set of inherited assumptions about how we should read, contextualize and criticize epigram—and specifically epigram in Roman reception. Balbilla was the granddaughter of the last king of Commagene, and a travelling companion of Hadrian's wife Sabina during the Imperial entourage's visit to Egypt in A.D. 130. The party visited Thebes soon after the accidental death in the Nile of Hadrian's favorite, Antinous, an incident which inspired ancient conspiracy theorists and continues to spice up the modern biographies.

Ἐκλυον ἀυδήσαντος ἔγω 'πυ λίθω Βάλβιλλα |
 φώνα(ς) τᾶς θείας Μέμνονος ἢ Φαμένωθ. |
 Ἦλθον ὕμῳι δ' ἐράται βασιλήιδι τυῖδε Σαβίνῃ, |
 ὥρας δὲ πρώτας ἄλιος ἦχε δρόμος. |
 Κοιράνω<ι> Ἀδριάνω πέμπτῳ δεκότη δ' ἐλνιάτῳ,
 (φῶτ)α δ' ἔχεσκε(ν) Ἄθυρ εἴκοσι | καὶ πέσυρα.
 Εἰκόστῳ πέμπτῳ | δ' ἅματι μῆνος Ἄθυρ.

(31 Bernand)

I heard from the speaking rock—I, Balbilla—the voice of divine Memnon, or Phamenoth. I came to you with the desirable Empress Sabina here, the sun's track had reached the first hour. In the fifteenth year of the Lord Hadrian; Hathyr had reached its twenty-fourth dawn. [Written] the twenty-fifth day of the month of Hathyr.

Like Trajan's lopsided nose, Balbilla's Memnon epigrams inspire stern aesthetic dressings-down in the modern critics ("None of Balbilla's verse is great poetry, and some is atrocious")—further proof of Symonds-esque decline, again with a contaminating sexual edge.²⁴ In the same breath, the critic coyly suggests that Balbilla was "perhaps [Sabina's] answer to Hadrian's Antinous." Balbilla does call Sabina "lovely" (καλά, 30.4 Bernand) and, here, "desirable" (ἐράται), but this is hardly her main concern in the four surviving epigrams—if anything, my choice of translation plays up the sex angle. Her pointedly Sapphic literary dialect does hold the door open for sexualized readings (hence my title for this section), but an interpretative community less predisposed to read for Roman softcore might instead find its attention caught by Balbilla's remarkably sure-footed negotiations of cultural identity and power across the four epigrams. Expatriate granddaughter of a king without a kingdom, wedged between a rock and a hard case, she plays

²⁴ Bowie (1990a: 62).

off Hadrian's claims to authority against Memnon's in order to assert an élite—but completely marginalized—transcultural identity as hybrid and precarious as Memnon's own. In this fourth (and probably final) short epigram, she not only advertises her own superior Greek *paideia* ("Memnon, or Phamenoth"); she also juggles the semantic frames which lend her voice authority, briefly adopting Hadrian's proprietary timeline only to discard it in favor of Memnon's own. (And likewise trying on for size an imported pseudo-Homeric appropriation of the colossus, only to tend towards a nativist recuperation—"Memnon, or Phamenoth" is by no means a bloodlessly antiquarian crux.) If, as Bowie compellingly suggests, Balbilla uses the epigrams to hint that she is—or *might* be—Sabina's consort, then that use opens up more questions than it shuts down. Is she laying bare a love-struck soul? Or writing her way into a freshly vacated subject-position closer to the center of power?

Put as bluntly as that, each of these formulations is as simplistic as the other; the second in particular elides, for instance, issues of irony and deniability, to say nothing of Hadrian's own position as Balbilla's—effectively, model—reader.²⁵ (Is this conversation really about Sabina at all?) But the first formulation is more problematic, and points towards problems (and attractions) in reading female-authored epigrams at Thebes and elsewhere against an inadequately reflexive interpretative frame. Modern readings of Balbilla and others see a vanished moment in the interpretative history of Roman erotic elegy (pre-Veyne, pre-lover's discourse) overwriting epigram's own generic codes. It is a truism that distinctions between elegy and epigram are always tenuous, but this in itself can contribute little to a satisfying account of our readiness to prioritize female-authored inscriptional epigram and to read it as "kiss and tell." Just like the prioritization of Emperors in literary epigram, the inscriptional foregrounding of women rests upon a complex and convenient scholarly genealogy in which histories of reception must play a prominent role.

One motivating if sporadic continuity with literary epigram's situation is modern reception's ongoing Emperor-worship at scholarly and popular levels, itself a minimal update of the Suetonian *donnée*. Modern accounts of the Memnon phenomenon, whether popular or academic, invariably

²⁵ Much, of course, turns here on the issue of exactly when the epigrams were inscribed: Bernand and Bernand (1960: 83) argue strongly for prompt inscription during the Imperial party's stay at Thebes.

play up the Hadrianic connection, with Balbilla as the crucial crossover figure. Her frozen moments of subjective self-revelation tantalize us with the prospect of a never-to-be-repeated transparency—a window through time into the private lives of the Imperial retinue.²⁶ In Balbilla's soft-focus Sapphisty, we once again see modern reception turning a Roman engagement with Greek epigram into titillating Imperial soap opera. A more consistent impetus, though, is the praiseworthy but at times insufficiently theorized feminist project of reclaiming women's voices in the ancient world. Inscriptional epigram claims a privileged position within this project; it holds out the promise of bypassing the potentially crippling ascriptional and persona issues which have increasingly complicated our attempts to engage with real or putative women literary authors, with Sulpician elegy an obvious case in point. Read wishfully, Memnon's female-authored texts encourage a retention of just the kinds of biographically and emotionally transparent reading that the scholarship on Sulpician elegy has learned (slowly and reluctantly) to disallow. Their inscriptional status shouts "document," inviting us to shed our lit.-crit. caution in a rush to reanimate a personally lived subjective history (and, joining the dots, a social history too).²⁷ Again, though, as my reading of Balbilla's fourth epigram suggests, we need to take a step back from passionate grand narratives and engage with the local and specific.

*Vidi pyramidas sine te, dulcissime frater,
et tibi, quod potui, lacrimas hic maesta profudi,
et nostri memorem luctus hanc sculpo querelam.
Si<c> nomen Decimi <G>entia<n>i pyramide alta,
pontificis comitisque tuis, Traiane, triumphis,
lustra<que> sex intra censoris, consulis, e<x>s<t>e<t>.*

(CIL 3.21 and 6625 = ILS 1046A = CLE 270)

I have seen the pyramids, but without you, sweetest brother; and I have poured out what offering I could—my tears of sorrow. I incise this lament, too; it carries the memory of our anguish. Thus on a lofty pyramid there may survive the name of Decimus Gentianus: priest; companion, Trajan, at your triumphs; censor, too, and consul, all inside a thirty-year span.

²⁶ E.g., Lindsay (1968: 323–5); Bowie (1990a: 63–6 and esp. 65); or, playing the Imperial-soap angle for all it's worth, the symptomatically derivative Perrotet (2002: 371).

²⁷ For a nuanced and compelling account of Sulpicia in reception see Skoie (2002).

This epigram by a female Roman tourist of the early second century A.D. comes to us via a fourteenth-century pilgrim's inexpert copy; its original, incised on the limestone facing of the Great Pyramid, is long since lost to local spoliation.²⁸ A useful discussion by Emily Hemelrijk contextualizes Terentia's poem²⁹ against cultural forms including tourist "graffiti" (with Memnon as the inescapable point of reference—Terentia is always Memnon's satellite) and, of course, Hellenistic sepulchral epigram. Hemelrijk and, latterly, John Quinn have also explored the epigram's Latin literary connections. Catullus' verse epitaph for his brother (*Carmen* 101) is one obvious intertext by which Terentia fashions herself as a genre-aware author—and simultaneously inscribes her genre as primarily Latinate, via an up-front (and ever so slightly disingenuous) parade of literary models. Clearly, then, she knows her Martial as well as her Ovid, Catullus, and Horace.³⁰ As Hemelrijk has observed, part of the fun here is the way Terentia outdoes Horace's famous sphragis to the *Odes*, 3.30, which pitched his figurative literary monument higher than the proverbial pyramids (*exegi monumentum . . . pyramidum altius*, 3.30.1–2). Terentia's playful, ante-raising rewrite is itself a move straight out of Hellenistic epigram. She cites as she sites, making her imitation the real thing by explicitly locating *her* text on an actual pyramid (*uidi pyramidas*).³¹ This embedded paratext also asserts the poem's literary value, implicitly but confidently anticipating selection by some future anthologist—just as has in fact happened. Terentia's epigram is now a prize exhibit of *Diotima*, the online feminist classics resource.

But Terentia's *uidi pyramidas* bids for much more than recuperation as a "woman's voice." Her games with genre(s) are intricate on a number of levels. Her inscriptional epigram is insistently Roman in its autobiographical register, and in its timekeeping scheme of five-year *lustra* (did Balbilla read Terentia on her way south?). Writing inscriptional epigram in Latin in this context is itself a piquant choice which invites

²⁸ I use John Quinn's text at <http://www.stoa.org/diotima/anthology/terentia.shtml>. On the history of publication, Hemelrijk (1999: 335, n. 112).

²⁹ As Quinn (previous note) remarks, "She was called Terentia, if, as is likely, the name which the German visitor garbled in the fourth line is that of Decimus Terentius Gentianus, consul suffectus under the Emperor Trajan in 116."

³⁰ Hemelrijk (1999: 171–2) on Terentia's wide-ranging allusivity, particularly on the relationship of line 3 to Egypt-connected Horace *Odes* 3.11.51–2. Still, Hemelrijk cannot help playing the lit.-crit. appraisal game: "she seems to be a mere versifier" (1999: 171), "it is composed rather clumsily and has no aesthetic value" (1999: 172).

³¹ On the intricate interplay of notional setting and modes of address in Hellenistic sepulchral epigram, see now, and definitively, Bruss (2005b).

speculation about potential readerships and uses. Roman tourists' epigrams on Memnon and elsewhere are typically in Greek, the language both of cosmopolitan travel and of the "best" generic models. Is this an "epigram" (written by a gauche and gawping Roman "tourist"), an "elegy," a smart Catullan *uersiculus*, a returned-to-sender Horatian ode? Terentia's text sits on a fence between cultures, genres, and literary traditions. Cheops' certified Wonder of the World becomes a billboard for the author's skill at keeping her options open—and her penchant for audacious appropriation. Terentia reconfigures it as a monumental tomb-*cum*-cenotaph in a hybrid and increasingly reflexive Roman idiom. In particular, Terentia overlays Giza onto the Via Appia at Rome's Capena Gate. A long and mutually complicating back-story of Roman receptions of Egypt—a narrative that is itself already self-consciously "Hellenistic" in its genealogy—feeds a patrician family's monumental one-upmanship. Decimus Gentianus' cenotaph is a Tomb of Cestius writ—very—large, running through a slightly flashier *CV* than Cestius' own (censor and consul come out ahead on points over praetor, septemvir and tribune of the plebs) in a pointedly similar honorific idiom.³²

Terentia's bizarre version of a *monumentum aere perennius* is a fascinatingly self-aware palimpsest. Poised uneasily between "inscriptional" and "literary," "Greek" and "Roman," it achieves effects unavailable to either. At once post-Horatian and pre-Hellenistic, an unlikely and compromised survivor, it bids for and wins enduring memorialization (perhaps not the "intended" one) by its simultaneous engagement with, and ironic distance from, a dissonant array of genres and cultural practices. Consciously ultra-Catullan in its ego-narration, it fixes an identity for its author only incidentally and between the lines, as a by-product of modern historicizing interpretation—"Terentia" is read in as a side-effect of the currently preferred identification of her brother "Decimus Gentianus."³³ Then again, that "Terentia" is read at all (and even has her own website) is a function of a contemporary academic marketplace tickled by transculture and keen to push courses on "Women in Antiquity." Once again, receptions and receptions-of-receptions prove hard to tease apart—and lend each other intriguing nuance.

³² C. Cestius Epulo's inscription: C CESTIUS L F EPULO PR TR PL | VII VIR EPULONUM.

³³ On Gentianus, see SHA Hadrian 23.5. Hemelrijk (1999: 171) pushes for autobiographical closure in Terentia's text by positing lost lines: "It ends abruptly and the name of the author is lacking. We do not know how many lines are missing..."

5. “*Lydia, O Lydia, O have you met Lydia...*”

Appropriately, Latin literary epigram is almost the last place we should look for Hellenistic epigram in Roman reception. It is not until very late, with the generation of Ausonius (fourth century A.D.), that epigrammatists working in Latin advertise their attentive reading of the *Garlands*; “the sheer crudity of [their] reaction... lends support to the hypothesis that they had suddenly been introduced to something quite new.”³⁴ From the early Empire we really only have Martial, whose relation to Hellenistic material is almost wholly indirect—“muted echoes” mediated in equal share by the contemporary Greek skoptic epigrammatists and by preceding Latin authors in a range of verse genres; even his grasp of Philip’s authors appears largely second-hand. The Greek authors from whom he borrows are mostly recent or contemporary—the likes of Strato, Lucian, Lucillius and Rufinus.³⁵ Perhaps the evident shabbiness of Martial’s relationship to older Greek epigrammatic traditions (“he doesn’t write, he doesn’t call...”) is itself a finely tuned act, part of his comic routine:

*Amphitheatrales inter nutrita magistros
venatrix, silvis aspera, blanda domi,
Lydia dicebar, domino fidissima Dextro,
qui non Erigones mallet habere canem,
nec qui Dictaea Cephalum de gente secutus
luciferae pariter uenit ad astra deae.
non me longa dies nec inutilis abstulit aetas,
qualia Dulichio fata fuere cani:
fulmineo spumantis apri sum dente perempta,
quantus erat, Calydon, aut, Erymanthe, tuus.
nec queror infernas quamuis cito rapta sub umbras.
non potui fato nobiliore mori.*

(11.69)

A huntress nursed among the trainers of the Amphitheater, fierce in the woods but gentle in the home, I was called Lydia—ever faithful to my master Dexter. He would not have preferred to have Erigone’s hound, or the one of Dictaeian bloodline which followed Cephalus and shared his journey to the stars of the light-bringing goddess. Long passage of days did not claim me, nor useless old age, the kind of end which the

³⁴ Cameron (1993: 78–92; quote on 92); more charitably, Kay (2001: 13–9).

³⁵ Sullivan (1991: 84–6; quote on 84), impressively backed up by his Appendix II at 322–5.

Dulichian dog met; rather I fell to the gleaming tusk of a foaming boar, one as huge as yours, Calydon, or yours, Erymanthus. Nor do I complain, though snatched too swiftly to the shades below: for I could not have died by a nobler end.

Martial's dead dog barks out Greek learning worthy of—and derivative of—learned Hellenistic commentary and didaxis; the thorough modern commentator responds in kind, relating the poem to (among others) a Hellenistic epigram known from a papyrus of the third century B.C. and finding plausible correspondences of detail.³⁶ No comment, however, is forthcoming on the jaw-dropping comic incongruity of an epigram which ambitiously emulates the playful reflexivity celebrated by the new scholarship in Hellenistic sepulchral epigram.³⁷ Greek-named Lydia name-drops her way through an overlong and socially pretentious (*Dictaea... de gente, fato nobiliore*) first-person memorialization—just who does this bitch think she is? And whose, and—*how*? Roman-named owner Dexter, the text's implicit candidate for footing the notional mason's bill, is rhetorically fitted up for the role of devoted and grieving husband (*domino fidissima Dextro, / qui non... mallet habere*) to an exemplary dog-matrona (*blanda domi*) reared in the shadow of the Colosseum—the poem's very first word, *Amphitheatrales*, ties Lydia to the *Urbs*' panoptic architectural hub (and the shady types who lurk in its arcades—her *magistri*). Big-city Rome's appropriation of Greek epigram's tropes and trimmings turns out to be less of a match made in heaven than Lydia's owner and/or author might have envisaged. Is Lydia even such a *good* dog? Martial's (ab)use of semi-attached personal names fits Imperial Greek skoptic practice to his own ambitious structural (meta-)poetics.³⁸ Lydia at 11.69 is framed in the *libellus* by the allusively skoptic Lydias of 11.21—slack-flued whore, Martial's had her, they all have, *uenatrix* indeed; and 11.102—bit of a dog, that one, and she'll shut up if she knows what's good for her:³⁹

³⁶ Authors of didactic *cyngetica* in the Imperial era include Arrian, ps.-Oppian and (in Latin) Gratius and Nemesianus; the tradition stretched back to Xenophon. Kay (1985: 215) on Page (1941: 460), lines 3–4: *σὺς ἢ ρ' ἀπὸ τῶς Καλυδῶνος / λείψανον*; less compellingly, Sullivan (1991: 326) adduces Tynnes *AP* 7.211.

³⁷ Again, Bruss (2005a).

³⁸ On large-scale intratextuality and satire in Martial see Boyle (1995); Lorenz (2004); Roman (2001); briefly, Nisbet on satiric epigram in this volume.

³⁹ On misogyny and aggressive silencing of women in Lucillius, Nisbet (2003a: 76–81). To 11.21's Lydia, *tam laxa... piscinam me fuisse puto* (11.21.1 and .12), cf. Nicarchus *AP* 11.328.5 *δόμον εὐρώεντα*. Face of a dog as comic hyperbole for ugliness: Lucillius *AP* 11.212; and cf. *AP* 11.196.

*et sua plus nulli quam tibi lingua nocet...
portentum est, quotiens coepit imago loqui.*

(11.102.6, 8)

no-one's tongue harms them more than yours does... it's a bad sign when a statue starts to speak.

Dog-Latin Lydia's cod-Hellenism is retrospectively muzzled—she always knew she wasn't supposed to whine (*nec queror*), and Martial's intratextual *Urbs* has no house-room for a Greek-style speaking *imago*. Freaks like Memnon are all very well in package-tour Egypt, but Dexter's monument to his dogwife can keep its mouth shut. Except of course that it can't, and Martial knows it; his/Dexter's ersatz-Greek, (*faux*-)inscriptional epigram is voiced by every passing Roman-in-the-(*faux*-)street, and hack-for-hire Martial was the one who put it “there” for them/us to read in the first place. Both ponderously referential and pointedly anti-allusive, 11.69 dramatizes and pokes fun at the author's poor faith with Hellenistic and Hellenizing models alike—the text knows we've read Catullus *Carmen* 3, the poem that made it impossible to take post-Hellenistic dead-pet poems seriously ever again, but meticulously avoids linguistic overlap as if we'll be fooled for a moment. “Inscriptional” and “literary,” “Greek” and “Roman” blur once again—Martial is (self-parodically) the seasoned pro where Terentia was (self-“revealingly”) a talented amateur, but the dynamic and overall frame of reference are the same. We might do well to keep these surprises in mind as we embark on our histories of epigram in Imperial—and other—reception.

THE MODERN RECEPTION OF GREEK EPIGRAM

Kenneth Haynes

The first printed edition of the *GA*, based on a late copy of the *API*,¹ was edited by Janus (also Giovanni) Lascaris and published in Florence in 1494.² Aldus Manutius' edition followed in 1503, based on Lascaris' edition but containing a few additional epigrams and some variant forms of others;³ subsequent Aldine editions appeared in 1521 and 1551.⁴ For much of the early modern period, the standard text was that by Henri Estienne (Geneva, 1566), also based on the Planudean source, and including in an appendix a number of epigrams gathered from other sources.⁵ Greek epigrams reached a larger public in the form of selected editions, and in particular those made by Joannes Soter (1525),⁶ Janus Cornarius (1529),⁷ and Estienne (1570).⁸ The *AP* became widely known only after Claude de Saumaise found it in Heidelberg in 1606; however, publication of most of it had to wait until Richard Brunck's *Analecta* of 1772–6, and it was not until the edition of Friedrich Jacobs in 1813–7 that its epigrams were published in full. At the time, therefore,

¹ See Hutton (1935: 117, n. 1 and 119), Turyn (1972–3: 435–42), and Cameron (1993: 175).

² See Proctor (1900: 78–83, 168–9) and Manoussakas and Staikos (1987: 92–3). On the typography (the Greek was printed in majuscules) see further Lowry (1979: 134–5), Pontani (1992), and Wilson (1992: 98–9). On Lascaris, see Ghisalberti (1960: 63.785–91).

³ Hutton (1935: 149–50) believes that the source of the additional and variant epigrams was Planudes' autograph, which formed part of Bessarion's bequest to Venice; see, however, Lowry (1979: 231).

⁴ See Hutton (1935: 171–2 and 230–2).

⁵ See Schreiber (1982: 142–3) for bibliographic details and on Estienne's new system of diacritical marks for proper nouns. Kecskeméti (2003: 140–4) reprints Estienne's prefatory matter.

⁶ Hutton (1935: 274–83) lists the epigrams and their translators. It went through three editions and served as the basis for several subsequent anthologies; see Hutton (1935: 38).

⁷ Cornarius' *Selecta epigrammata* is based on the second edition of Soter. Hutton (1935: 283–6) lists the epigrams and their translators. Soter's and Cornarius' editions were much cheaper than the Aldine editions.

⁸ See Schreiber (1982: 154–5) and Kecskeméti (2003: 259–64). The selected edition includes his own Latin translation into both prose and verse, as well as other verse translations; these are enumerated in Hutton (1946: 138–41).

when Greek epigram exerted its greatest influence on European poetry, it was largely known from a bowdlerized and incomplete text.⁹

To chart the reception of Greek epigram in Europe since the Renaissance is complex. It is often difficult or impossible to determine, in individual cases, the precise epigram that served as a source. It may, for example, be present in the *GA* (in whichever edition), and it may exist in several versions there; or it may have been found in another Greek writer (Athenaeus, Diogenes Laertius, and Plutarch, in particular, quote numerous epigrams), or in an ancient Latin translation or adaptation (Ausonius was a major conduit for Greek epigrams in early modern Europe).¹⁰ It may also have been read in a neo-Latin or vernacular translation. Moreover, before the nineteenth century it makes little sense to isolate “Hellenistic” epigrams from the others, since they were not distinguished as such before then.

The reception of Greek epigrams took many forms: copying, editing, printing, and commenting on them; studying them in school or university; writing imitations of them, first a scholar’s activity (e.g., Poliziano, Scaliger, Heinsius)¹¹ and then a gentleman’s pastime as well; translating them from Greek to Latin, from Greek to the vernacular, or from a Latin translation to a vernacular one; writing Latin or vernacular epigrams; theorizing about them, as by inquiring into their genre and their relation to other literary forms; quoting them in handbooks, essays, histories, and other prose (the international popularity of Erasmus’ *Adagia*, for example, brought attention to the Greek epigrams quoted in it);¹² incorporating their images, motifs, or conceits into original verse; finding in them diverse inspiration for sonnets, madrigals, emblems, and many other poems; and so on.

The influence of the *GA* in France and Italy until 1800 was fully documented by James Hutton, and to a lesser extent its fate elsewhere

⁹ On the fortunes of the *AP* before its rediscovery, see Cameron (1993: 178–201) and Pontani (2002).

¹⁰ Hutton (1935: 23), counting with very inclusive criteria, finds that imitations of about 75 epigrams from the *GA* circulated under Ausonius’ name in the Renaissance, about two-thirds of which are now considered genuine. Peiper (1976) includes spurious epigrams in his Teubner edition of Ausonius.

¹¹ Angelo Poliziano’s Greek epigrams were first published, posthumously, in 1498 and exist in a modern edition, Poliziano (2002); Joseph Scaliger’s translation of Martial into Greek was published in 1607; Daniel Heinsius’ epigrams were published in *Peplus graecorum epigrammatum* (1613) and *Poemata graeca et e graecis latine reddita* (1616). See Cassio (1973) for Poliziano’s notes on the *GA*.

¹² Hutton (1946: 215–6).

has also been studied.¹³ This essay cannot hope to be comprehensive; nor is it possible to offer even representative coverage of all aspects of the reception of Greek epigram since the Renaissance. The goal here is to provide a basic outline of the modern reception with the focus narrowed to literary history; it will concentrate on major literary issues and figures. The chapter is divided into three sections: theoretical and critical discussions, neo-Latin poems, and vernacular poems.

Theoretical and critical discussions

What is an epigram? Renaissance readers knew that it was a short poem and that it had its historical origin as an inscription, but much else was unclear: its style, meter, subject, maximum length, and above all, its genre. The first full discussion seems to be the short treatise “de epigrammate” which Francesco Robertello appended to his commentary on Aristotle’s *Poetics* (1548).¹⁴ An epigram is a small part (*particula*) of other forms of literature. Just as comedy or tragedy are small parts of epic, so too epigrams are small parts of those forms. The subjects proper to epigram are those of the larger forms. Funerary epigrams belong to the category of tragedy; satiric epigrams belong to comedy, which ridicules vice (amatory epigrams are also comic); epigrams that are laudatory of a hero, city, etc., belong to epic. The proper language for epigrams is also derived from that of the larger forms; Catullus and Martial are the main models.¹⁵

The most important discussion, however, was that by Julius Caesar Scaliger, in his posthumously published *Poetices* (1561). It gave a decisive form to the main theoretical issues, and its influence lasted until nearly the end of the eighteenth century. An epigram is not, as Robertello (and others) claimed, a part of a larger poem. There are as many kinds of epigrams as there are things; they may use all the varieties of versification and the whole range of diction. Scaliger offers a taxonomy based instead on Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*, dividing epigrams into the three kinds of oratory (amatory epigrams, for example, are deliberative). He then identifies the two intrinsic virtues of epigrams: *brevitas* and *argutia*.

¹³ For Italy, France, England, Spain, and Germany, see Hutton (1935), Hutton (1946), Hutton (1925), Rothberg (1954), and Rubensohn (1897), respectively.

¹⁴ See pp. 35–41 of the appendix (with its own pagination) in Robertello (1968).

¹⁵ For discussion see Hutton (1935: 61–2) and Weinberg (1961: 1.400–1).

Immediately after his discussion, Scaliger gives an appendix devoted to the styles of epigrams. They can be divided into two sorts. The first are characterized by *mel*; they take Catullus for a model and are “molli, tenera, laxa, affectus in se amatorios continentia.” The second, like Martial’s, are “vivida, vegeta, acria.” Epigrams of the latter sort can be subdivided into four subtypes: those in which, respectively, *foeditas*, *fel*, *acetum*, and *sal* are found.¹⁶

These distinctions were fateful. Most ancient genres were known by metaphoric or metonymic attributes—comedy by the *soccus*, tragedy by the *cothurnus*, pastoral by the *avena*, and so on. Scaliger added four more: *mel*, *fel*, *acetum*, and *sal* (he banned *foeditas*). These not only constituted a taxonomy for scholars but were regularly adopted by poets as images and themes. Du Bellay introduces his book of sonnets *Les Regrets* (1558) with the epigram “Ad lectorem,” announcing the presence of *fel*, *mel*, and *sal* in the book, the bitterness of exile, the sweetness of nostalgia, the salt of satire; *fel* and *sal* dominate the sequence, as *mel* had dominated *L’Olive* (1549). In the sonnets of Sidney’s *Astrophel and Stella* (1591), *mel* is present in abundance, and the epithet “sweet” occurs there with great frequency, as it does in Shakespeare’s sonnets (1609).¹⁷

In practice, Scaliger’s four distinctions were often elided to two, *mel* and *sal*, or *mel* and *fel*; these were the two types of the sweet and the sharp epigram, of which Catullus and Martial were the respective models.¹⁸ In France Maurice Scève and Clément Marot were regarded as exemplary *mel* and *sal* writers, respectively.¹⁹ In England, epigram was often assimilated to *sal* or *fel*, at least in theory. John Harington contrasted the sugar of the sonnet with the salt of the epigram,²⁰ and Ben Jonson feared that the name *Epigrammes* would lead readers to expect poems “full of gall,”²¹ although his collection consists not only of pointed satirical epigrams but also of epistolary ones.²² Shakespeare’s sonnets show a unique mastery “of salt and sweet,” of the two kinds or modes of epigrams, “now setting the two modes off against each other, now displaying them as parts of an interlocking whole.”²³

¹⁶ See Scaliger, Book 3, ch. 125 (1994: 3.202–16); for discussion, see Hutton (1935: 63–5) and Colie (1973: 68).

¹⁷ Fowler (2003: 191–2) provides a table and statistics.

¹⁸ See Colie (1974: 87).

¹⁹ See Colie (1974: 87) on Thomas Sebillet.

²⁰ Harington (1926: 66).

²¹ Ben Jonson, “To My Booke,” the second of the *Epigrammes* in the 1616 *Workes*.

²² Trimpi (1962: 167–90).

²³ Colie (1974: 95). See also Fowler on hybrid genres (1982: 184).

By what right may Shakespeare's sonnets be described as epigrammatic? What is the relation of an epigram to a sonnet? In one formulation, they are strictly distinguished. For Antonio Minturno in 1564, an epigram was a brief instantiation of epic, in contrast to a sonnet ("l'Epigramma è particella dell' Epica poesia, il Sonetto della Melica"), and the two should therefore remain distinct.²⁴ It was more common, however, to stress their similarities and sometimes even their identity. In the *Comento de' mei sonetti* (of uncertain date), Lorenzo de' Medici stressed the "grande similitudine e conformità" of the sonnet with the epigram, as many others did subsequently.²⁵ The strong claim equating the two forms is found more than half a century later, in Thomas Sebillet's *Art poétique françoys* (1548): "Sonnet n'est autre chose que le parfait epigramme de l'Italien."²⁶ By mid-century, the identification was regularly made by literary critics;²⁷ it was also evident in the overlapping and sometimes interchangeable use of the terms "epigram" and "sonnet."²⁸

Epigrams were associated not only with sonnets but with other short vernacular forms, such as the *huitain*, *dizain*, *douzain*, and *strambotto*;²⁹ elegy and even epithalamium show its influence.³⁰ In 1554 Giovan Pigna compared the epigram with the madrigal,³¹ and this was by no means only a theoretical comparison. Tasso's madrigals, for example, are frequently in debt to the *GA*, whether in the form of allusion, imitation, or translation; his madrigal "A la signora Tarquinia Molza," in response to *AP* 7.669 (= "Plato" 1 *FGE*), was one of his most popular.³² More generally, under the influence of classical models, the Italian madrigal evolved after mid-century in the direction of an epigrammatic style.³³

²⁴ Minturno (1971: 240).

²⁵ Medici (1992: 586). Fernando de Herrera, in his commentary (1580) on Garcilaso de la Vega's verse, reproduces the argument of Lorenzo de' Medici; see Brown (1975).

²⁶ Sebillet (1932: 115); Book 2, chap. 1, is devoted to the epigram, and chap. 2 to the sonnet.

²⁷ Including Giovanni Pigna (*I Romanzi*, 1554) and Benedetto Varchi (*L'Ercolano*, 1570); these are discussed by Hutton (1935: 56–7) and Colie (1974: 84–5).

²⁸ Examples are given by Colie (1974: 89). Neo-Latin writers sometimes translate "sonnet" by "epigramma;" see Hutton (1935: 58, n. 1).

²⁹ See Hutton (1946: 46), Angress (1971: 27), and Colie (1974: 85–6).

³⁰ Fowler (1982: 198).

³¹ Pigna (1997: 62).

³² Hutton (1935: 331–2).

³³ Praz (1958: 208), Schulz-Buschhaus (1969: 148–252), Hausmann (1972: 8–9), and Tomlinson (1987: 83–5).

The literary form of the emblem is at least as confused as that of the epigram, and there is substantial overlap between them. The major impetus for the development of the emblem was the publication of Andrea Alciato's *Emblemata* in 1531, which would appear in more than 200 editions and in many translations.³⁴ Many other collections were subsequently printed throughout Western Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. At least in the sixteenth century, emblems tended to emulate the formal aspects of epigram, in its brevity and its pointed conceit.³⁵ In addition, Greek epigrams often served as a direct source: a third of the emblems in Alciato's first collection were translated from the *GA*,³⁶ and Greek epigrams would continue as an important source for many subsequent emblem books.³⁷ Although the term "emblem" soon came to refer to the illustration accompanying the epigram, Alciato himself never referred to illustrations,³⁸ which appear to have been added to the 1531 publication without his knowledge or assent. For him, an emblem was not to be distinguished from an epigram; in any case, the great popularity of his illustrated emblem book added a new, visual dimension to the epigrams.

Scaliger called *argutia* the soul of epigrams, and he found that Martial was superior to Catullus in attaining it.³⁹ (Elsewhere he allowed that *argutia* was essential only for Latin epigrams, since in Greek different rules obtained.)⁴⁰ Point was also sought in discussions of Italian poetry. Lorenzo de' Medici wrote that *acume* is found in both the sonnet and epigram, and Tasso recorded that the common opinion was to reserve *acutezza* for the end of poems.⁴¹ However, in the sixteenth century the emphasis on pointedness was limited, and it was not uncommon to

³⁴ Manning (2002: 43).

³⁵ Praz (1964–74: 22–3) makes a strong case for the logical connection between epigram and emblem; Russell (1999: 281) describes them as becoming less alike over time. For a discussion of the emblem in its relation to epigram, see Laurens (1989: 419–61).

³⁶ See Hutton (1935: 201), Praz (1964–74: 26), and Saunders (1982). See further below.

³⁷ In later editions Alciato added only about ten more translations while doubling the number of emblems, according to Hutton (1935: 204). Henkel and Schöne (1967) document the source of numerous emblems.

³⁸ See Miedema (1968) and Scholz (1986).

³⁹ Scaliger (1994: 3.204); Scaliger (1994: 3.206): "Epigrammatis duae virtutes peculiare: brevis et argutia. Hanc Catullus non semper est assecutus, Martialis nusquam amisit."

⁴⁰ Scaliger (1994: 5.112–3).

⁴¹ Medici (1992: 586) and Tasso (1998: 2.679); on them see Colie (1974: 83, 85).

dislike pointed epigrams. In 1546 Paolo Giovio related that Andrea Navagero (who had died in 1529) would curse Martial's volumes every year and offer them to Vulcan; he praised the "praedulcis prisca suavitas" of Navagero's verse, without salted and stinging conclusions ("non salsis aculeatisque finibus").⁴² It has been maintained that in early cinquecento Italy, epigrammatists generally preferred the *GA* and Catullus to Martial, as they did in France throughout much of the sixteenth century.⁴³ In his essay "Des Livres," Montaigne prefers the "l'egale polissure et cette perpetuelle douceur et beauté fleurissante des Epigrammes de Catulle" to "tous les esguillons dequoy Martial esquisse la queue des siens."⁴⁴

In contrast, the dominant style of seventeenth-century poetics—metaphysical wit in England, *concettismo* in Italy, *cultismo* in Spain—was one of conceit or wit, and the theory and example of the epigram was important in the development of this style. The *argutia* of the epigram was invoked in numerous contexts by Baroque theorists of wit,⁴⁵ and Greek epigrams themselves, usually at some remove, yielded a number of points or conceits for poets.⁴⁶ The epigram became a model even for prose.⁴⁷ Nonetheless, Latin epigrams, especially Martial's, were more frequently pointed and more often influential than Greek ones. In his *Agudeza y arte de ingenio*, Baltazar Gracián celebrates the moralized and pointed wit of Martial's epigrams.⁴⁸

In the seventeenth century, beginning in France, the pointedness of epigrams was involved in a new way of contrasting epigrams. The older Renaissance distinction between *mel* and *sal* epigrams was largely made with reference to Latin literature, to Catullus and Martial; many Renaissance discussions of the epigram made little reference to Greek specifically, despite the influence of Greek epigrams in poetic practice.⁴⁹ The new battle was between Greek and Latin epigrams, contrasted as naïve and pointed, respectively. The change in reputation is epitomized in an anecdote. When Marie de Gournay, the "fille d'alliance" of

⁴² Giovio (1956: 8.102–3).

⁴³ See Hutton (1935: 43, 189) and Hutton (1946: 34); cf. Bradner (1954: 70).

⁴⁴ Montaigne (1962: 391).

⁴⁵ See Praz (1958: 206–9) and Fowler (1982: 198).

⁴⁶ Ruthven (1969a: 21, 23).

⁴⁷ Roukhomovsky (2001: 124–32).

⁴⁸ He also praises Alciato's emblems; see Rothberg (1956).

⁴⁹ Minturno (1970: 413) and (1971: 280) is an exception; Scaliger's remark (see n. 40, above) was made incidentally in a discussion of Angeriano.

Montaigne, showed the poet Honorat de Racan some of her epigrams (they would be published in 1626) and asked his opinion, he replied that he did not like them and that they lacked point. She defended them by saying that they were “Épigrammes à la Grecque.” Later at dinner they were served a poor soup, which Racan defended by calling it “soupe à la Grecque.” The mot was widely repeated and became a critical commonplace, in Racan, Malherbe, Bouhours (who nonetheless offers a meek defense of Greek epigram), and others.⁵⁰

The preference, and usually strong preference, for Martial’s epigrams over Greek ones is connected to the preference for Rome over Greece; this is implicit in Malherbe and Boileau and explicit in Montesquieu, who took the absence of point to be evidence that the Greeks were timid in thought.⁵¹ A more positive attitude toward Greek epigram, or even basic comprehension, is not common among literary critics prior to the new Hellenism of the mid-eighteenth century,⁵² at which time its reputation began to change again. In 1771, for example, Voltaire favored Greek epigram over those of both Martial and Catullus, no longer distinguishing between the two Roman poets who had once defined alternatives.⁵³

Because of the cultural dominance of France in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, its attitude toward epigram was widely held across Europe. Fashionable advice, like Lord Chesterfield’s to his son, reiterated the French contempt for Greek epigrams.⁵⁴ The understanding of the whole genre altered: epigram became dissociated from lyric, equated with pointed wit, and assimilated mainly to satire. Moreover, as the definition of the epigram became more precise, its status within the hierarchy of genres sank, to become the “fag end of poetry.”⁵⁵ For all its decline in status, however, epigram in its pointed and satiric

⁵⁰ Hutton (1946: 451–2) quotes the anecdote from *Menagiana* (1693); see also Hutton (1946: 53–4 and 489) and Lund (2003: 73).

⁵¹ Montesquieu (1899: 2.30–1); see Hutton (1946: 60).

⁵² Rapin in *Reflexions sur la poétique* (1674), Batteux in *Cours de belles-lettres* (1747–50), and Mallet in his article “Épigramme” for the *Encyclopédie* (1751–80) were among the main defenders. See Hutton (1946: 57–8, 61, and 537).

⁵³ In the article “épigramme” in the *Questions sur l’Encyclopédie*, part 5 (not yet edited by the Voltaire Foundation). In the essay, Voltaire offers several new translations that he appears to have fashioned from older ones; see Hutton (1946: 539–46). In general, Voltaire had a narrowly conventional view of the Greeks (see Jory 1976).

⁵⁴ Chesterfield (1932: 3.725); see Hutton (1946: 60).

⁵⁵ Edward Philips, preface to the *Theatrum poetarum* (1675); reprinted in Spingarn (1908–9: 2.266); discussed by Fowler (1982: 217).

incarnation retained the ability to infect other styles and was a recurrent source of anxiety for neo-classical writers.⁵⁶ In *L'Art poétique* (1674), for example, Boileau complained that the epigram had overwhelmed Parnassus, enveloping the other forms where it did not belong.⁵⁷

It was Lessing who provided the important theoretical discussion of the epigram which changed the terms of the debate. Since Opitz,⁵⁸ German critics had often equated the epigram with satire⁵⁹ and seldom considered Greek epigram specifically.⁶⁰ In his “Zerstreute Anmerkungen über das Epigramm und einige der vornehmsten Epigrammisten” (1771), Lessing develops in his own way yet another traditional distinction, namely Scaliger’s contrast between an epigram “cum simplici cuiuspiam rei vel personae vel facti indicatione” and one “ex propositis aliquid deducens.”⁶¹ For Lessing, both kinds of epigram depend on an “Erwartung” and “Aufschluß;” however, in the simpler type of epigram, the expectation is provided by some external object, while the more complex epigram must provide both the expectation and the resolution. He valued only the second kind as epigrams, and above all those of Martial.⁶²

In his review of Lessing’s essay, Herder applauded the theoretical clarity with which Lessing discussed the intrinsic nature of the epigram, but he found the rejection of the *GA* too oppressive and sought to defend the simpler kind of epigram. In 1785, Herder published a fuller rebuttal, “Anmerkungen über das griechische Epigramm.”⁶³ He accepted the fundamental distinction which Lessing drew between kinds of epigrams, but contradicted him as to their value: “ich bekenne aber, daß manche dieser simplen Expositionen für mich viel mehr Rührendes und Reizendes haben, als die geschraubte epigrammatische

⁵⁶ See Lund (2003).

⁵⁷ See *L'Art poétique*, Chant 2.103–28, in Boileau (1966: 165–6); see also Hutton (1946: 54) and Fowler (1982: 196).

⁵⁸ Opitz (1966: 21).

⁵⁹ See Angress (1971: 27) and Weisz (1979: 18–21).

⁶⁰ Weisz (1979: 38).

⁶¹ Scaliger (1994–: 3.204).

⁶² Lessing (1954–8: 7.7–140), discussed by Beutler (1909: 46–7), Angress (1971: 22–6), Dietze (1972: 317–22), and Woessner (1978: 86–117).

⁶³ The review is reprinted in Herder (1877–1913: 5.338–45) and the essay in Herder (1877–1913: 15.337–92). It is discussed by Beutler (1909: 48–68), Angress (1971: 22–25), and Dietze (1972: 322–7). Beutler’s comments on Herder are reproduced in Pfohl (1969: 352–72).

Spitzföndigkeit späterer Zeiten.”⁶⁴ With this description, the value of epigram as lyric is reinstated, with a new emphasis on feeling.

Sainte-Beuve wrote a number of articles on Greek epigram, two of which provide an extended discussion of a Hellenistic poet: an article on Meleager in 1845 and an analysis of the poems of Leonidas of Tarentum in the first of two articles in 1864 that had been prompted by the appearance of Frédéric Dehèque’s complete translation of the *GA*.⁶⁵ Sainte-Beuve is primarily interested in the lyrical quality of Greek epigram, and in both articles he draws comparisons with the history of French lyric, putting a line of Lamartine’s next to one of Meleager’s, and examining at length Chénier’s imitation of Leonidas. He praises “cette touchante simplicité, ce naïf et ce fin”⁶⁶ that characterize Greek literature in general as well as Meleager specifically; in a comparison of Chénier and Leonidas, he stresses the “simplicité” and “charme nu” of poetry.⁶⁷ The invocation of Greek simplicity was intended to correct what he considered an overemphasis on the ideal aspect of Greek civilization.⁶⁸

Sainte-Beuve may have been the last major critic to care greatly for Greek epigram and to believe that it could offer valuable guidance for contemporary poetry. Nonetheless, others deserve mention, particularly three influential British critics: John Wilson (“Christopher North” of *Blackwood’s Magazine*), who devoted a five-part article to the *GA* and its English translators in 1833;⁶⁹ John Addington Symonds, who brought critical attention to the full range of poems in the *GA*, and in particular to the pederastic poems of Meleager and Strato, in his history of Greek literature;⁷⁰ and J. W. Mackail, whose *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology* (1890), with a long introduction, went through a number of editions and was frequently reprinted.

⁶⁴ Herder (1877–1913: 15.348). His attempt at a new taxonomy of epigrams (15.366–7) did not meet with success.

⁶⁵ The first essay is reprinted in Sainte-Beuve (1908: 407–44), and the other two in Sainte-Beuve (1864–70: 7.1–52).

⁶⁶ Sainte-Beuve (1908: 416).

⁶⁷ Sainte-Beuve (1864–70: 7.27).

⁶⁸ For discussion, see Mulhauser (1969: 147–80).

⁶⁹ Wilson (1833).

⁷⁰ See Symonds (1873–6: 1.373–82), expanded in (1880: 2.315–29).

Neo-Latin Poems

Even before the *editio princeps* of 1494, the *GA* was known in several Italian cities,⁷¹ and poets in Ferrara and above all Florence were drawn to translate or imitate its epigrams. In the former city, the minor writer Antonio Costanzi (d. 1490) and the important Hungarian poet Janus Pannonius (d. 1472) studied with Guarino da Verona and may have read the *GA* with him; each of them went on to translate about two dozen Greek epigrams (published posthumously in each case).⁷² In his own epigrams, Pannonius was influenced both by Martial and by Greek examples.⁷³ In Florence, Poliziano and Michele Marullo are the most notable of the early poets who translated Greek epigrams. Poliziano wrote Latin epigrams in addition to Greek ones, including translations of fifteen poems from the *GA*, which was occasionally a source for his original verse, notably *Nutricia*.⁷⁴ Marullo arrived in Florence in 1489 and likewise wrote Latin epigrams, including seventeen imitations from the *GA* in his volume *Epigrammata* (1493) and elsewhere.⁷⁵ The pathos of his epitaphs has been admired in particular, and some of these show the influence of the *GA*.⁷⁶

From the late 1490s and through the first third of the sixteenth century, Italian writers produced an enormous number of Latin epigrams. "Under Leo X Latin epigrams were like daily bread," Burckhardt wrote.⁷⁷ Of the many poets who turned at this time to translating or imitating Greek epigrams, perhaps three were the most influential: Alciato, the "representative in modern letters" of the anecdotal epigram;

⁷¹ Copies of the *GA* were made in Italy from the 1460s and appear to have circulated fairly widely; see Hutton (1935: 36–7) and Bradner (1954: 64). Not treated here are those translations of the *GA* which circulated under the name "Ausonius" and which may have been the work of Giorgio Merula (as Peiper argues in his edition of Ausonius).

⁷² Prete (1978: 103–118) discusses Costanzi's epigrams, giving textual variants and a few unpublished epigrams. See further Hutton (1935: 111–2) and Ghisalberti (1960–: 30.370–4). On Pannonius' verse translations from Greek, see Ritoók (1972); more generally, see Birnbaum (1981). On the text of his epigrams, see Barrett (1982); cf. Pannonius (1951).

⁷³ See Gortan (1972) and Bradner (1954: 66).

⁷⁴ See Hutton (1935: 124–40) and Semerano (1951). Bausi in Poliziano (1996) does not find the influence of the *GA* as often as Hutton (1953: 133, n. 1).

⁷⁵ By Hutton's count (1935: 112–3); see Marullo (1951).

⁷⁶ See Bradner (1954: 69) and, in general, Kidwell (1989).

⁷⁷ Burckhardt (1958: 1.270). For an overview of the Latin epigram in the Quattrocento, see Bradner (1954) and Prete (1981).

Angeriano, who played that role in regard to the erotic epigram; and Navagero, with the votive epigram.⁷⁸ The very large impact of Alciato's emblem books was noted above. In the first edition (1531), some forty of the emblems were translated from the *GA*;⁷⁹ however, even before then, Alciato had translated 165 epigrams, most of which were published in Janus Cornarius' *Selecta epigrammata Graeca Latine versa* in 1529, and thirty of which would eventually be reused for the emblem book.⁸⁰ In choosing epigrams for the emblems, Venus, a frequent theme of his epigrams in Cornarius, was eschewed, and mythological themes (of which Cupid is the most common) are outnumbered by epigrams in which stories or moral anecdotes are told.⁸¹

Girolamo Angeriano, though virtually unknown today, wrote Latin poems that were reprinted in Naples, Venice, and twice in Paris; they seem to have been read in England,⁸² and in France influenced Du Bellay, Ronsard, and other poets of the Pléiade.⁸³ His *Ἑρωτοπαίγνιον* (Florence, 1512) includes 169 short poems, almost all concerned with his unhappy love for Celia,⁸⁴ and about thirty of these are translations or draw their inspiration from Greek epigrams.⁸⁵

Andrea Navagero did not write a great deal of Latin verse, but what he wrote has enjoyed a high reputation. The first eighteen poems of *Lusus* (1530, published posthumously) broadly imitate the *GA*, sometimes translating or developing particular epigrams.⁸⁶ Most of them are *vota*, dedicatory epigrams. The second poem, for example, is an imitation of "Bacchylides" 1 *FGE* (= *AP* 6.53), the dedication by a rustic of a temple to Zephyr. Navagero's imitation, in turn, inspired poems by both Ronsard ("D'un vanneur de blé au vent Zefire") and Du Bellay ("Vœu d'un vanneur de blé aux vents").⁸⁷ Through Navagero's example, Book 6

⁷⁸ Hutton (1946: 49). For a critical discussion of the Latin erotic epigram in the Renaissance and its relation to antiquity, see Laurens (1989: 375–418).

⁷⁹ Hutton (1935: 204) counts 40 in the first edition and Saunders (1982: 9), 38. Ten more were added in subsequent editions.

⁸⁰ Hutton (1935: 198, n. 3); cf. Saunders (1982: 3), who counts one fewer.

⁸¹ Saunders (1982: 7, 10, 13–4).

⁸² By Giles Fletcher; see Hutton (1935: 170).

⁸³ Ghisalberti (1960: 3.255).

⁸⁴ Firpo (1973: 3). Or 168, as in Ghisalberti (1960: 3.255).

⁸⁵ Hutton (1935: 170).

⁸⁶ See Navagero (1973: 84) and Hutton (1935: 192).

⁸⁷ For a discussion, see Hutton (1935: 190), Hutton (1946: 332–6), and Silver (1981–7: 3.384–7). Pater (1980: 140) offered Du Bellay's poem as the epitome of the poetry of the Pléiade.

of the *GA* became the basis for a new sub-genre of short poems, above all in France, where the *vœu* flourished in the Renaissance.⁸⁸

French poets imitated and translated many Greek epigrams in Latin, though typically with less effect than they had in the vernacular. Three of them might be mentioned, none as significant as the best Italians. Nicolas Bourbon imitated more than eighty epigrams from the *GA* in *Nugae* (1533, expanded 1538), sometimes offering multiple imitations of the same epigram.⁸⁹ Unpublished Latin translations of fourteen epigrams have been attributed to Jean Dorat,⁹⁰ whose published poems include a few echoes of Greek epigrams and, in 1576, one translation. Jean-Antoine de Baïf⁹¹ published his *Carmina* in 1577, in which he translated or imitated more than seventy epigrams,⁹² but unlike several other members of the Pléiade, it is questionable how effectively he used Latin.

More influential were the translations by French scholars.⁹³ In 1570 Henri Estienne published his selection of 260 epigrams,⁹⁴ each accompanied by his prose translation, one or more of his verse translations, and often verse translations by other hands. It contains a tour de force: 106 versions of the last distich of *AP* 6.76.⁹⁵ Joseph Scaliger, in his posthumous *Poemata omnia* (1615), produced versions of more than 120 epigrams, more than half of which are taken from the erotic poems of Book 5 of the *AP* (= Book 7 of the *APL*).⁹⁶

Latin humanists of the Low Countries, as in France, were better at making scholarly translations of Greek epigrams than in responding to them as poets. The major exception is Janus (or Joannes) Secundus,

⁸⁸ See Hutton (1946: 41–2, 332); for the *votum* in Spain, see Rothberg (1954: 80–1).

⁸⁹ See Hutton (1946: 84–7), Bourbon (1945), and for background Phillips (1984).

⁹⁰ The attribution was made by Hutton (1946: 112–14, 297–300).

⁹¹ It was Jean de Baïf's father, Lazare de Baïf, to whom Du Bellay attributed (falsely) the introduction of the word "epigramme" into French (Du Bellay 1966: 193).

⁹² Hutton (1946: 348–50).

⁹³ National labels are particularly misleading here and are used only as a pragmatic way of organizing material. Henri Estienne joined his father in Geneva in 1551; Scaliger moved to Leiden in 1593; George Buchanan spent most of his early life in France; Erasmus can hardly be pinned down to Leuven, Paris, or Basel; and they all travelled extensively.

⁹⁴ Hutton (1946: 135); see Kecskeméti (2003: 260).

⁹⁵ As a curiosity, it may be mentioned that the English schoolmaster John Stockwood made 450 Latin versions of *AP* 5.224 in *Progymnasma scholasticum* (1597), pp. 413–449.

⁹⁶ Hutton (1946: 152–7); see the reminiscence by Vertunien quoted in Grafton (1983–93: 1.180).

who translated more than a dozen epigrams⁹⁷ and who must have known well the translations made by Alciato, his teacher at Bourges;⁹⁸ however, the *GA* seems to have had little impact on his two most widely read works, the *Basia* and the *Elegiae* (both published after his death in 1536). Erasmus included translations of forty-five epigrams, mostly by his own hand, in the *Adagia* by the time of the 1533 edition.⁹⁹ Perhaps the most remarkable accomplishment was the complete translation of the *APL* by Hugo Grotius, completed by 1631, but not published until De Bosch's edition of 1795–1822. His translations were praised even while they remained in manuscript,¹⁰⁰ and the ninth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1875–89) would canonize them as “the best versions of the Anthology ever made.”¹⁰¹

In Elizabethan and Jacobean England, there was not a great deal of interest in making Latin translations of Greek poems and drama (as opposed to patristic works).¹⁰² However, William Lily and Thomas More maintained a friendly rivalry to translate Greek epigrams, and their competing translations of eighteen epigrams were published in *Progymnasmata* (1518). More further translated some ninety epigrams from the *GA* in his *Epigrammata*, also published in 1518; in both cases the translations had been made earlier in the century.¹⁰³ England is unusual in that long after the demise of humanism, major poets continued to write Latin poems that translate or imitate Greek epigrams. Thomas Gray translated thirteen epigrams, perhaps in 1742.¹⁰⁴ Samuel Johnson translated more than ninety: in the last months of 1784, during the sleepless nights of his last illness, he “amused himself by translating into Latin verse, from the Greek, many of the epigrams in the *Anthologia*.”¹⁰⁵

⁹⁷ Hutton (1946: 220–3). See the recent editions of Secundus (1991), (2000), and (2005–). The edition by Bosscha (1821) records many parallels and echoes.

⁹⁸ Schoolfield (1980: 47).

⁹⁹ Hutton (1946: 215–7).

¹⁰⁰ Hutton (1946: 263).

¹⁰¹ R[ichard] G[arnett], in the article “Anthology.” See also Sandys (1958: 2.317–8).

¹⁰² Binns (1990: 229–31).

¹⁰³ Binns (1990: 519, n. 43); see More (1963–1997: 3.2.18–22) and Hudson (1947: 37–45) for an evaluation of More's skill as a translator (“adequate, though not extraordinary,” Hudson (1947: 44)). Cameron (1993: 182–5) argues that More was in possession of the *AP*.

¹⁰⁴ Gray (1966) and Gray (1969: 332–7); for the date, see Carper (1974); for Gray's Latin poems generally, see Haan (2000).

¹⁰⁵ Boswell (1964: 4.384). There are several modern editions; see in particular Johnson (1995: 198–263) and (2005: 80–119).

The elegiac epigrams of Walter Savage Landor, perhaps the best of his Latin poems, show that it was possible, even in the mid-nineteenth century, to make models from the *GA* “entirely [one’s] own.”¹⁰⁶

The Scottish humanist George Buchanan was well regarded for his Greek; his translations of epigrams include thirteen poems from the *GA* which seem to have been widely known (in two cases they were even transcribed by hand into printed copies of the *GA*).¹⁰⁷ His own epigrams were of diverse kinds, satiric, epitaphic, complimentary, amatory, and others.¹⁰⁸ The most popular British epigrammatist was the Welshman John Owen (at least forty-five editions of his Latin text were published on the continent before 1800),¹⁰⁹ but he was a follower of Martial, who was also the main model for the Latin epigram in Germany, either directly or through the very strong influence of Owen. A partial exception is Konrad Celtis’ collection of epigrams (first published centuries after his death in 1508) which besides the satiric epigrams include epitaphs and other kinds, as well as two attempts to write Greek epigrams himself.¹¹⁰ Another is provided by Philipp Melanchthon (d. 1560), whose Latin translations from classical and sacred authors appeared in collections of his epigrams.¹¹¹

Vernacular Poems

Greek epigram is diversely present in many short poems of the modern European literatures, especially in the first two centuries after the publication of the *GA*. It has been echoed innumerable times, either directly or more often through classical Latin, neo-Latin, or vernacular intermediaries. Shakespeare’s “small Latine and less Greeke” did not prevent him from writing two sonnets (153 and 154) derived, via an

¹⁰⁶ This was the judgment of Bradner (1940: 322). Landor’s Latin verse can be found in *Poemata et inscriptiones* (1847) and in sections of *Dry Sticks* (1858) and *Heroic Idyls* (1863). For a discussion, see Kelly (1974).

¹⁰⁷ McFarlane (1981: 185–8). See further Thomson (1957: 67–8) and Ford (1982: 37–8).

¹⁰⁸ Bradner (1940: 136–8).

¹⁰⁹ Poole-Wilson (1989). On Owen see Laurens (1989: 503–43).

¹¹⁰ See Celtis (1963), on the text see Wuttke (1973) and Kemper (1975); see also Schnur (1973: 561) and Spitz (1957: 91).

¹¹¹ The *Epigrammatum libri sex* was published in 1563, shortly after his death. See Hutton (1935: 277) on some of his translations from the *GA*.

unknown source, from *AP* 9.627.¹¹² In many instances, it will not be clear whether a vernacular poem was derived from an epigram at all. Conceits in a love poem, for instance, may be common to the *GA*, the *Anacreontea*,¹¹³ and other classical sources, as well as to Petrarch and other vernacular and neo-Latin sources, without necessarily being indebted to each other. In addition to yielding echoes of words, phrases, and conceits, Greek epigrams were important for their genre, which had an impact on the evolution of numerous forms, including madrigals, emblems, sonnets, and others; they also provided ideals and examples for desiderated aspects of literary style, such as brevity, wit, conceit, and eroticism. No effort will be made here to survey this enormous range of literature; instead, a few representative instances of poets engaged with Greek epigrams will be discussed, with the emphasis placed on innovative efforts by major poets. These fall mainly in the Renaissance but also accompany the Hellenic enthusiasms of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

Early attempts in Italy to naturalize the classical epigram¹¹⁴ were not as successful as in France, where the *GA* exerted an influence both wide and deep in the second half of the sixteenth century. In the previous generation, Clément Marot and others¹¹⁵ had introduced classical forms, including epigram, into French, but Marot did not know Greek and only occasionally echoed Hellenistic epigrams. It is with the *Pléiade*, and above all with the verse of Baïf and Ronsard, that Greek epigram entered the main line of vernacular lyric. In his early collections of love poems, *Les Amours de Méline* (1552) and *Les Amours de Francine* (1555), Baïf drew on Petrarchan themes and neo-Latin poetry but also imitated poems from the *GA*, transforming them into sonnets, elegies, and songs. *Passetems*, vol. 4 of the *Euvres en rime* (1572–3), is the next significant development of French epigram after Marot; of its 325 poems, almost a fifth were derived from the *GA*.¹¹⁶ Ronsard translates a number of epigrams in his early collections, *Livret de folastries* (1553) and *Les Continuation des amours* (1555–6), but his finest response came

¹¹² See Hutton (1941).

¹¹³ For the *Anacreontea* in sixteenth-century France, see O'Brien (1995).

¹¹⁴ Claudio Tolomei and others, *Versi et regole* (1539); Luigi Alamanni, *Epigrammi con alcuni epitaffi* (1587, written by 1546); see Hutton (1935: 299–300, 302–5).

¹¹⁵ Such as Michel D'Amboise and Mellin de Saint-Gelais; see Hutton (1946: 303–5 and 318–20).

¹¹⁶ Hutton (1946: 47, 337–50). See also Chamard (1939–40: 2.143–4, 3.198–9).

later, when he turned, in 1578, to the erotic epigrams, from which a dozen sonnets of the *Sonnets pour Hélène* were derived.¹¹⁷

This broad infusion of Greek epigrams into the vernacular poetry of sixteenth-century France was unique; nonetheless, in most of the literatures of early modern Europe major poets, at least on occasion, translated, imitated, or were inspired by these poems. In their lyric poems, both Tasso and Marino frequently take their inspiration from Greek epigrams.¹¹⁸ In Spain, where the *GA* was not printed in any language in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it was nonetheless read in imported editions and in the Latin versions found in Alciato, Ausonius, and Erasmus; poets such as Luis de León,¹¹⁹ Quevedo,¹²⁰ Lope de Vega,¹²¹ and others responded to a variety of the themes and topoi of the Greek originals. In Poland, Jan Kochanowski's *Fraszki* (1584) presented three books of epigrams (or "trifles"), of which eight are labeled "Z Greckiego."¹²² In Germany, Alciato's emblems were translated in the sixteenth century, but a fuller engagement with Greek epigram had to wait for the Baroque poets, and especially Martin Opitz, whose translations into German were collected in *Florilegium variorum epigrammatum* (1639) and Book 4 of *Die poetischen Wälder* (1644).¹²³ The first English versions seem to be the three which appeared in *Tottel's Miscellany* (1557), one of which is attributed to Thomas Wyatt.¹²⁴ Two fuller English selections followed in the sixteenth century,¹²⁵ but the

¹¹⁷ Hutton (1946: 350–74). See also Chamard (1939–40: 2.54–6, 70–71) and more generally Silver (1981–7).

¹¹⁸ The influence is particularly strong in Tasso's madrigals and the ecphrastic poems of Marino's *Galleria*; see Hutton (1935: 330–3 and 349–55).

¹¹⁹ Rothberg (1981).

¹²⁰ Crosby (1966).

¹²¹ Rothberg (1975).

¹²² For discussion, see Adler (1970), Pelc (1980: 270–307), and Fiszman (1988: 369). On the Latin epigram in Poland in the first half of the sixteenth century, see Budzisz (1988).

¹²³ See Rubensohn (1897: clxxxvii–ccxli, 37–52, 105–31). He offers an index of German translations of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries on pp. 182–93. The translations by Opitz are reprinted in Opitz (1975: 2.383–95); the second volume of Opitz (1975) also includes the *Florilegium variorum epigrammatum*, which is appended, with its own numeration, after p. 464. For a history of the German epigram, see Dietze (1972); on Lessing's epigrams, see Woessner in particular (1978).

¹²⁴ See Rollins (1965: 1.79, 105).

¹²⁵ Both George Turberville, *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs, and Sonets* (1567), and Timothy Kendall, *Flowers of Epigrammes* (1577), translate a number of Greek epigrams. On Turberville and the *GA*, see Sheidley (1972).

highpoint in English was probably Robert Herrick's *Hesperides* (1648), a work which blends classical, neo-Latin, and English epigrammatic traditions.¹²⁶

After the Renaissance, poets continued to translate and imitate Greek epigram, but oblique responses were often the most interesting. For example, a couple of La Fontaine's fables are ultimately indebted to the *GA*,¹²⁷ but the influence is more general: he re-establishes the link between the Aesopian apologue and the epigram.¹²⁸

By the second half of the eighteenth century, Greek epigram began to assume a new and somewhat wider importance. André Chénier loved the *GA* with a poetic intensity that had not been known for centuries, and he integrated a number of Greek epigrams into his longer works, the *Bucoliques* and *Élégies*; his most famous poem, *La Jeune Tarentine*, shares much in common with the funerary epigram.¹²⁹ In Weimar, Herder seems to have started a vogue for Greek epigram in 1780, when he showed translations to several friends, including Goethe, who responded with a dozen epigrams in the Greek style.¹³⁰ Goethe was attracted by the urbanity, the highly civilized polish, of the original, in which he found distance from the tragic mythology of Greece; he was no less interested in exploring the possibilities of a genre and a meter.¹³¹ In the 1820s, Pushkin wrote a number of imitations of Greek epigrams, under the influence both of Chénier and of Batiushkov's translation of a dozen poems from the *GA*;¹³² his critical development as a poet in that decade, his rejection of the poetic language of the previous generation, has been connected with this influence.¹³³ In English the versions by Prior, Cowper, and Shelley are notable, and Landor's poem "Dirce" (1831) is a striking resurrection of the Hellenistic epigram. As late as

¹²⁶ See Coiro (1988: 45–77, esp. 61). McEuen (1968: 218–50) discusses the influence of the *GA* on Herrick and other members of Ben Jonson's circle.

¹²⁷ Hutton (1946: 478–9) speculates on the intermediate sources that connect "Le Trésor et les deux hommes" and *AP* 9.44 (= Flaccus 8 *GP Garland*) and "Le Rat et l'huître" and *AP* 9.86 (= Antiphrilos 34 *GP Garland*).

¹²⁸ See Fumaroli (2002: 345).

¹²⁹ Hutton (1946: 579–88), Rogers (1974: 13–51), Brunet (1996), and Jouan (1996).

¹³⁰ See Beutler (1909: 48–109), reprinted in Pfohl (1969: 352–415). Herder's translations appear in vol. 26 of Herder (1877–1913).

¹³¹ See Trevelyan (1981: 114–8).

¹³² *O grecheskoi antologii* (St Petersburg, 1820). Batiushkov translated from the French which Sergei Semenovitch Uvarov prepared for him. See further Kažoknieks (1968: 64–6, 142–5).

¹³³ See Reeder (1976).

the early twentieth century, the *GA* was one of the poetic models for Pound's and H.D.'s Imagism.¹³⁴

Greek epigram did not disappear from subsequent European and North American poetry, though it has retreated. A continued presence is evident mainly in translations, notably by the Italian poet Salvatore Quasimodo,¹³⁵ and also by minor poets writing in English such as Dudley Fitts, Kenneth Rexroth, Tony Harrison, and Peter Whigham.¹³⁶

E.R. Curtius, writing against the background of the Second World War, insisted that "European literature is an 'intelligible unit,' which disappears from view when it is cut into pieces."¹³⁷ To study the reception of even a small form like Greek epigram necessarily brings European literature into view as such a unit.

¹³⁴ H.D. was much more strongly influenced by Greek epigram than Pound; see Babcock (1995). Pound's "Homage to Quintus Septimius Florentis Christianus" (1916) translates and adapts six Greek epigrams; for commentary see Ruthven (1969b: 81–3). The title indicates that the poem is dedicated to Florent Chrestien, whose Latin translations from the *GA* were published posthumously in 1608.

¹³⁵ See Quasimodo (1958) and (1969). On his involvement with Greek epigrams, see Gigante (1970: 49–63).

¹³⁶ See Fitts (1956), Rexroth (1962), Harrison (1975) and Whigham (1975). Jay (1981) provides translations of Greek epigrams by several dozen poets, mostly made in the third quarter of the twentieth century. For a history of English versions from the *GA*, see Cook (1919: 357–78), who lists 62 English translations published between 1577 and 1919.

¹³⁷ Curtius (1953: 14).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acosta-Hughes, B. 2002. *Polyeideia: The Iambi of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition*. Berkeley.
- . 2004. "Alexandrian Posidippus: On Rereading the GP Epigrams in Light of P.Mil. Vogl. VIII 309." Pp. 42–56 in B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou, and M. Baumbach, eds. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P.Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)*. Washington.
- . forthcoming 2007. *Cantat Alexandria: Hellenistic Reception of Archaic Lyric*. Princeton.
- Acosta-Hughes, B. and Kosmetatou, E., eds. *New Epigrams Attributed to Posidippus of Pella. An Electronic Text-in-Progress. Classics@* 1: http://www.chs.harvard.edu/publications.sec/classics.ssp/issue_i_posidippus.pg.
- Acosta-Hughes, B., Kosmetatou, E., and Baumbach, M., eds. 2004. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P.Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)*. Washington.
- Adler, L. 1970. "Die Fraszka als literarische Gattungsform in den Fraszki Jan Kochanowskis." *Anzeiger für Slavische Philologie* 4: 1–38.
- Aevum Antiquum*. 1995. *Atti del Congresso "Poeti e filologi, filologi-poeti. Composizione e studio della poesia epica e lirica nel mondo greco e romano" (Brescia, 26–27 Aprile 1995)*. Milan.
- Ager, S. L. 2005. "Familiarity Breeds: Incest and the Ptolemaic Dynasty." *JHS* 125: 1–34.
- Alexiou, M. 2002. *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*. 2nd ed. Lanham, Maryland.
- Ambühl, A. 2002. "Zwischen Tragödie und Roman: Kallimachos' Epigramm auf den Selbstmord der Basilo (20 Pf. = 32 Gow-Page = AP 7.517)." Pp. 1–26 in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, G. C. Wakker, eds. *Hellenistic Epigrams*. Leuven.
- Anderson, R.D., Parsons, P.J., and Nisbet, R.G.M. eds. 1979. "Elegiacs by Gallus from Qasr Ibrim." *JRS* 69: 125–55.
- Angiò, F. 2004. "Nota all'ep. 36 AB di Posidippo (P.Mil. Vogl. VIII 309, col. VI 10–17)." *APF* 50: 15–7.
- Angrss, R. K. 1971. *The Early German Epigram: A Study in Baroque Poetry*. Lexington, Kentucky.
- Argentieri, L. 1998. "Epigramma e libro. Morfologia delle raccolte epigrammatiche premeleagree." *ŽPE* 121: 1–20.
- . 2003. *Gli epigrammi degli Antipatri*. Bari.
- Arland, W. 1937. *Nachtheokritische Bukolik bis an die Schwelle der lateinischen Bukolik*. Leipzig.
- Arnold, H. L. and Detering, H., eds. 1996. *Grundzüge der Literaturwissenschaft*. Munich.
- Arrighetti, G. 1967. "La biografia di Pindaro del papiro di Ossirinco XXVI, 2438." *SCO* 16: 129–48.
- . 1987. *Poeti eruditi biografati. Momenti della riflessione dei Greci sulla letteratura*. Pisa.
- . 1994. "Riflessione sulla letteratura e biografia presso i Greci." Pp. 211–249 in F. Montanari, ed. *La philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine*. Vandoeuvres-Geneva.
- Arthur, M. B. 1980. "The Tortoise and the Mirror: Erinna P.S.I. 1090." *CW* 74: 53–65.
- Asmis, E. 1990. "Philodemus' Epicureanism." *ANRW* 2.36.4: 2369–406.
- . 1995. "Epicurean Poetics." Pp. 15–34 in D. Obbink, ed. *Philodemus and Poetry: Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus, and Horace*. Oxford.

- Asper, M. 1997. *Onomata allotria: Zur Genese, Struktur und Funktion poetologischer Metaphern bei Kallimachos*. Stuttgart.
- . 2001. "Gruppen und Dichter: Zu Programmatik und Adressatenbezug bei Kallimachos." *A&A* 47: 84–116.
- Aubretton, R., with Irigoin, J., and Buffière, F., eds. 1994. *Anthologie Grecque: Tome XI: Anthologie Palatine, Livre XII*. Paris.
- Austin, C. 2002. "Posidippus and the Mysteries... of the Text." Pp. 7–19 in G. Bastianini and A. Casanova, eds. *Il papiro di Posidippo un anno dopo*. Florence.
- Austin, C., and Bastianini, G., eds. 2002. *Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt omnia*. Milan.
- Babcock, R. G. 1995. "Verses, Translations, and Reflections from 'The Anthology': H. D., Ezra Pound, and the Greek Anthology." *Sagetrieb* 14: 202–16.
- Bakhtin, M. M. 1986. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. eds. C. Emerson & M. Holquist; trans. W. McGee. Austin.
- Bakker, E. J. 1993. "Activation and Preservation: The Interdependence of Text and Performance in an Oral Tradition." *Oral Tradition* 8: 5–20.
- . 1997. *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse*. Ithaca.
- Barbantani, S. 1993. "I poeti lirici del canone alessandrino nell'epigrammatistica," *Aevum(ant)* 6: 5–97.
- . 2001. *ΦΑΤΙΣ ΝΙΚΗΦΟΡΟΣ. Frammenti di elegia encomiastica nell'età delle Guerre Galatiche: Supplementum Hellenisticum 958 e 969*. Milan.
- Barchiesi, A. 2000. "Rituals in Ink: Horace on the Greek Lyric Tradition." Pp. 167–82 in M. Depew and D. Obbink, eds. *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Bardon, H. 1952. *La littérature latine inconnue*. 2 vols. Paris.
- Barigazzi, A. 1968. "Il testamento di Posidippo di Pella." *Hermes* 96: 190–216.
- . 1982. "Su alcuni epigrammi dell'Antologia Palatina." Pp. 17–55 in *Studi in onore di A. Colonna*. Perugia.
- Barnes, J. 1995. *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle*. Cambridge.
- Barrett, A. A. 1982. "Notes on the Text of Janus Pannonius' Epigrams." *Florilegium* 4: 228–35.
- Barthes, R. 1968. "L'effet du réel." *Communications* 11: 84–9.
- Basson, J. 1917. *De Cephalae et Planude syllogisque minoribus*. Berlin.
- Bastianini, G., ed. 2002. *Un poeta ritrovato: Posidippo di Pella. Giornata di studio, Milano 23 novembre 2001*. Milan.
- Bastianini, G., and Casanova, A., eds. 2002. *Il papiro di Posidippo un anno dopo*. Florence.
- , eds. 2006. *Callimaco: cent'anni di papiri*. Florence.
- Bastianini, G., and Gallazzi, C., eds., with Austin, C. 2001. *Posidippo di Pella: Epigrammi (PMil.Vogl. VIII 309)*. Milan.
- Battezzato, L. 2003. "Song, Performance, and Text in the New Posidippus." *ŽPE* 145: 31–43.
- Bauman, R. 1975. "Verbal Art as Performance." *American Anthropologist* n.s. 77: 290–311.
- Baumbach, M., and Petrovic, A. and Petrovic, I., eds. forthcoming 2007. *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*.
- Baumbach, M., and Trampedach, K. 2004. "'Winged Words': Poetry and Divination in Posidippus' *Oionoskopika*." Pp. 123–60 in B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou and M. Baumbach, eds. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus*. Cambridge.
- Baumlin, J. S., and Baumlin, T. F., eds. 1994. *Ethos: New Essays in Rhetorical and Critical Theory*. Dallas.
- Beazley, J. D., and Gow, A. S. F. 1929. "An Epigram from Cos." *CR* 43: 120–2.
- Beckby, H. 1957–8. *Anthologia Graeca*. 4 vols. Munich.

- Becker, A. S. 1992. "Reading Poetry through a Distant Lens: Ecphrasis, Ancient Greek Rhetoricians, and the Pseudo-Hesiod 'Shield of Herakles'." *AJP* 113: 5–24.
- . 2003. "Contest or Concert? A Speculative Essay on Ecphrasis and Rivalry between the Arts." *CML* 23.1: 1–14.
- Bell, C. 1997. *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions*. New York.
- Berndorf, O. 1862. *De Anthologiae Graecae epigrammatis quae ad artes spectant*. Leipzig.
- Bentley, R. 1761. *Callimachi fragmenta a Richardo Bentleio collecta*. In J.A. Ernesti, ed. *Callimachi hymni, epigrammata et fragmenta*. Leiden.
- Bergk, T. 1914. *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*, III: *Poetae Melici*. 4th ed. Leipzig.
- Bernabé, A. 1988. *Poetae epici Graeci*. vol. 1. Leipzig.
- Bernal, M. 1990. *Cadmean Letters*. Winona Lake.
- Bernard, A., and Bernard, É. 1960. *Les inscriptions du colosse de Memnon*. Paris.
- Bernard, É. 1969. *Inscriptions métriques de l'Égypte gréco-romaine: recherches sur la poésie épigrammatique des grecs en Égypte*. Paris.
- Bernardi Perini, G. 1997. "Valerio Edituo e gli altri." *Sandalion* 20: 15–41.
- Bernsdorff, H. 2001. *Hirten in der nicht-bukolischen Dichtung des Hellenismus*. Stuttgart.
- . 2002. "Anmerkungen zum neuen Posidippus." *GFA* 5: 11–44.
- Bertazzoli, V. 2002. "Arsinoe II e la protezione della poesia: una nuova testimonianza di Posidippo." *ARF* 4: 145–53.
- Bettarini, L. 2005. "Posidippo e l'epigramma epinicio: aspetti linguistici." Pp. 9–22 in M. Di Marco, B. M. Palumbo Stracca, and E. Lelli, eds. 2005. *Posidippo e gli altri: Il poeta, il genere, il contesto culturale e letterario. Atti dell'incontro di studio, Roma, 14–15 maggio 2004. Appunti Romani di Filologia* 6, 2004. Pisa.
- Bettenworth, A. 2002. "Asclepiades XXV G.-P. (A.P. 5,181). Ein Beitrag zum symposiisch-erotischen Epigramm." Pp. 27–38 in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker, eds. *Hellenistic Epigrams*. Leuven.
- Bettini, M. 1979. *Studi e note su Ennio*. Pisa.
- Beutler, E. 1909. *Vom griechischen Epigramm im 18. Jahrhundert*. Leipzig.
- Bilde, P., et al., eds. 1996. *Aspects of Hellenistic Kingship*. Aarhus.
- Bing, P. 1988a. "Theocritus' Epigrams on the Statues of Ancient Poets." *A&A* 34: 117–23.
- . 1988b. *The Well-Read Muse: Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets*. Göttingen.
- . 1993a. "The *Bios*-Tradition and Poets' Lives in Hellenistic Poetry." Pp. 619–31 in R. Rosen and J. Farrell, eds. *Nomodeiktēs: Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald*. Ann Arbor.
- . 1993b. "Impersonation of Voice in Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*." *TAPhA* 123: 181–98.
- . 1995a. "Callimachus and the Hymn to Demeter." *Syll Class* 6: 29–42.
- . 1995b. "Ergänzungsspiel in the Epigrams of Callimachus." *A&A* 41: 115–31.
- . 1998. "Between Literature and the Monuments". Pp. 21–43 in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit and G. C. Wakker, eds. *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*. Groningen.
- . 2000. "Text or Performance / Text and Performance: Alan Cameron's *Callimachus and his Critics*." Pp. 139–148 in R. Pretagostini, ed. *La Letteratura ellenistica: Problemi e prospettive di ricerca*. Rome.
- . 2001. "The Writing on the Girdle: Asclepiades 4 Gow-Page (*AP* 5.158)." Pp. 245–8 in *Alexandrian Studies II in Honour of Mostafa El-Abbadi*. Alexandria.
- . 2002a. "Medeios of Olynthos, Son of Lampon, and the *Iamatika* of Posidippus." *ζPE* 140: 297–300.
- . 2002b. "The Un-Read Muse? Inscribed Epigram and Its Readers in Antiquity." Pp. 39–66 in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker, eds. *Hellenistic Epigrams*. Leuven.
- . 2002/3. "Posidippus and the Admiral: Kallikrates of Samos in the Milan Epigrams." *GRBS* 43: 243–66.

- . 2003. "The Unruly Tongue: Philitas of Cos as Scholar and Poet." *CPh* 98: 330–48.
- . 2004. "Posidippus' *Iamatika*." Pp. 276–91 in B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou and M. Baumbach, eds. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves. Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309)*. Washington.
- . 2005. "The Politics and Poetics of Geography in the Milan Posidippus Section One: On Stones (AB 1–20)." Pp. 119–40 in K. Gutzwiller, ed. *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*. Oxford.
- . 2007. "Allusion from the Broad, Well-Trodden Street: The *Odyssey* in Inscribed and Literary Epigram." In P. Bing, *The Marble and the Scroll: Studies in Reading and Reception in Hellenistic Poetry*. Ann Arbor.
- . forthcoming 2007. "Hermeias of Kourion and the Culture of His Time (Athenaeus 13.563 d–e = Powell, Coll. Alex. p. 237)." In I. Taifakos, ed. *Hellenism in Cyprus from Stasinos to Demonax*. Leiden.
- Bingen, J. 2002. "Posidippe: Le poète et les princes." Pp. 47–59 in G. Bastianini, ed. *Un poeta ritrovato: Posidippo di Pella. Giornata di studio, Milano 23 novembre 2001*. Milan.
- Binns, J. W. 1990. *Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England: The Latin Writings of the Age*. Leeds.
- Biondi, G. G. 1998a. "Catullo." Pp. 2,461–84 in I. Lana and E. V. Maltese, eds. *Storia della civiltà letteraria greca e latina*. 3 vols. Torino.
- . 1998b. "Lutazio Catulo e i preneoterici." Pp. 2,431–42 in I. Lana and E. V. Maltese, eds. *Storia della civiltà letteraria greca e latina*. 3 vols. Turin.
- . 2003. "Lo iato in Catullo." *Paideia* 58: 47–76.
- Birnbaum, M. D. 1981. *Janus Pannonius: Poet and Politician*. Zagreb.
- Blank, D. L. 1998. *Sextus Empiricus: Against the Grammarians*. Oxford.
- Blänsdorf, see *FPL*.
- Bleisch, P. R. 1996. "On Choosing a Spouse: *Aeneid* 7.378–84 and Callimachus' *Epigram* 1." *AJPh* 117: 453–72.
- Blomqvist, J. 1998. "The Development of the Satirical Epigram in the Hellenistic Period." Pp. 45–60 in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit and G. C. Wakker, eds. *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*. Groningen.
- Blum, R. 1977. *Kallimachos und die Literaturverzeichnis bei den Griechen: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Biobibliographie*. Frankfurt a. M.
- . 1991. *Kallimachos: The Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography*. trans. H. H. Wellisch. Madison.
- Blumenthal, A. von. 1922. *Die Schätzung des Archilochos im Altertume*. Stuttgart.
- Boas, M. 1905. *De Epigrammatis Simonideis. Pars Prior. Commentatio Critica de Epigrammatum Traditione*. Groningen.
- Bodel, J. 2001. *Epigraphic Evidence*. London.
- Boedeker, D. and Sider, D. 2001. *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*. New York.
- Boehm, G. 1995. "Bildbeschreibung: Über die Grenzen von Sprache und Bild." Pp. 23–40 in G. Boehm and H. Pfotenhauer, eds. *Beschreibungskunst—Kunstbeschreibung: Ekphrasis von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*. Munich.
- Boileau Despréaux, N. 1966. *Œuvres complètes*. ed. F. Escal. Paris.
- Bollansée, J. 1999. "Aristotle and Hermippos of Smyrna on the Foundation of the Olympic Games and the Institution of the Sacred Truce." *Mnemosyne* 52: 562–7.
- Bolmarich, S. 2002. "Hellenistic Sepulchral Epigrams on Homer." Pp. 67–83 in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit and G. C. Wakker, eds. *Hellenistic Epigrams*. Leuven.
- Bonaccini, E., and Magnelli, E. 1998. "Alciph. 3, 12, 5 e alcuni composti in ὁρθο- da riconsiderare." *A&R* 43: 61–9.
- Bond, G. W. 1952. "Archilochus and the Lycambides: A New Literary Fragment." *Hermathena* 80: 3–11.
- Bosscha, P. 1821. *Joannis Nicolai Secundi Hagani opera omnia*. Leiden.

- Boswell, J. 1964. *Boswell's Life of Johnson*. ed. G. B. Hill. rev. L. F. Powell. Oxford.
- Bosworth, B. 1999. "Augustus, the *Res Gestae* and Hellenistic Theories of Apotheosis." *JRS* 89: 1–18.
- Bourbon, N. 1945. *Les Bagatelles*. ed. V. L. Saunders. Paris.
- Bousquet, J. 1992. "Deux épigrammes grecques." *BCH* 116: 585–606.
- Bowersock, G. W. 1984. "The miracle of Memnon." *BASP* 21: 1–4.
- . 1994. *Fiction as History: Nero to Julian*. Berkeley.
- Bowie, E. L. 1986. "Early Greek Elegy, Symposium and Public Festival." *JHS* 106: 13–35.
- . 1990a. "Greek Poetry in the Antonine Age." Pp. 53–90 in D. A. Russell, ed. *Antonine Literature*. Oxford.
- . 1990b. "Miles ludens? The Problem of Martial Exhortation in Early Greek Elegy." Pp. 221–9 in O. Murray, ed. *Symptotica: A Symposium on the Symposium*. Oxford.
- . 1994. "Greek Table-Talk before Plato." *Rhetorica* 11.4: 355–73.
- . 1997. "The *Theognidea*: A Step towards a Collection of Fragments?" Pp. 53–66 in G. W. Most, ed. *Collecting Fragments / Fragmente Sammeln. Aporemata* Band 1. Göttingen.
- . 2001. "Early Greek Iambic Poetry: The Importance of Narrative." Pp. 1–27 in A. Cavarzere, A. Barchiesi, and A. Aloni, eds. *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire*. Lanham, Maryland.
- . forthcoming. "Sex and Politics in Archilochus' Poetry: Archilochus and His Age." In *Proceedings of an International Conference on Archilochus, Paros October 2005*.
- Boyman, L. 1998. "Nossis, Sappho and Hellenistic Poetry." *Ramus* 27: 39–59.
- Bowra, C. 1936. "Erinna's Lament for Baucis." Pp. 325–42 in C. Bailey, E. A. Barber, C. Bowra, J. Denniston, and D. Page, eds. *Greek Poetry and Life*. Oxford.
- . 2001. *Greek Lyric Poetry: From Alcman to Simonides*. 2nd rev. ed. Oxford.
- Boyančé, P. 1937. *Le culte des Muses chez les philosophes grecs*. Paris.
- Boyle, A. J. 1995. "Evaluating the Unexpected Classic." *Ramus* 24: 82–101.
- Bradner, L. 1940. *Musae Anglicanae: A History of Anglo-Latin Poetry 1500–1925*. New York.
- . 1954. "The Neo-Latin Epigram in Italy in the Fifteenth Century." *Medievalia et humanistica* 8: 62–70.
- Braet, A. C. 1992. "Ethos, Pathos and Logos in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*: A Re-Examination." *Argumentation* 6: 307–20.
- Branham, R. B. 1993. "Diogenes' Rhetoric and the Invention of Cynicism." Pp. 445–73 in M.-O. Goulet-Cazé and R. Goulet, eds. *Le Cynisme ancien et ses prolongements*. Paris.
- Bravi, L. 2005. "Gli epigrammi di Simonide e il *PMil.Vogl.* VIII 309." Pp. 1–7 in M. Di Marco, B. M. Palumbo Stracca, and E. Lelli, eds. 2005. *Posidippo e gli altri: Il poeta, il genere, il contesto culturale e letterario. Atti dell'incontro di studio, Roma, 14–15 maggio 2004. Appunti Romani di Filologia* 6, 2004. Pisa.
- Bremmer, J. N. 1997. "Why Did Medea Kill Her Brother Apsyrtus?" Pp. 83–100 in J. J. Clauss and S. I. Johnston, eds. *Medea: Essays on Medea in Myth, Literature, Philosophy, and Art*. Princeton.
- Brennan, C. T. 1998. "The poets Julia Balbilla and Damo at the Colossus of Memnon." *CW* 91: 215–34.
- Breuer, C. 1995. *Reliefs und Epigramme griechischer Privatgrabmäler: Zeugnisse bürgerlichen Selbstverständnisses vom 4. bis 2. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* Cologne.
- Brioso Sánchez, M. 1978. "Sobre el hexámetro de la elegia y el epigrama griegos." *Habis* 9: 49–76.
- Brown, C. 1997. "Iambos." Ch. 1 in D. Gerber, ed. *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*. Leiden.
- Brown, G. J. 1975. "Fernando de Herrera and Lorenzo de' Medici: The Sonnet as Epigram." *Romanische Forschungen* 87: 226–38.

- Brunck, R. F. P. 1772–6. *Analecta veterum poetarum graecorum*. Strasbourg.
- Brunet, P. 1996. "Homère livré aux chiens: Hommage à André Chénier, lecteur de Madame Dacier." Pp. 71–82 in Rémy Poignault, ed. *Anniversaires 1994: Présence de l'antiquité chez Grégoire de Tours, François Rabelais, Voltaire, André Chénier, Anatole France, Jean Giraudoux*. Tours.
- Brunschwig, J., and Sedley, D. 2003. "Hellenistic Philosophy." Pp. 151–83 in D. Sedley, ed. 2003. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Philosophy*. Cambridge.
- Bruss, J. S. 2002–3. "A Program Poem of Alcaeus of Messene: Epigram 16 G-P (= *A.P.* 7.429)." *CJ* 98.2: 161–80.
- . 2004. "Lessons from Ceos: Written and Spoken Word in Callimachus." Pp. 49–69 in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker, eds. *Callimachus II*. Leuven.
- . 2005a. "Famous Last Words: *Aeneid* 5.870–71 and the Hellenistic Cenotaphic Epigramme." *Latomus* 64: 325–35.
- . 2005b. *Hidden Presences: Monuments, Gravesites, and Corpses in Greek Funerary Epigram*. Leuven.
- . forthcoming. "Ecphrasis in Fits and Starts: Down to 300 B.C." In M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic, and I. Petrovic, eds. *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*.
- Büchner, see *FPL*.
- Buddensiek, F. 1999. *Die Theorie des Glücks in Aristoteles' Eudemischer Ethik*. Göttingen.
- Budzisz, A. 1988. *Epigrammat Laciński w Polsce w Pierwszej Połowie XVI W wieku*. Lublin.
- Buecheler, see *CLE*.
- Buettner, R. 1893 [repr. 1970]. *Porcius Licinus und der literarische Kreis des Q. Lutatius Catulus*. Leipzig [Hildesheim].
- Bühler, K. 1934. *Sprachtheorie. Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*. Stuttgart.
- Bulloch, A. W. 1970. "A Callimachean Refinement to the Greek Hexameter." *CQ* 64: 258–68.
- Burckhardt, J. 1958. *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*. trans. S. G. C. Middlemore. 2 vols. New York.
- Burnikel, W. 1980. *Untersuchungen zur Struktur des Witzepigramms bei Lukillios und Martial*. Wiesbaden.
- Bury, J. B. 1900. "Notes on the VII book of the Greek Anthology. (Ed. Stadtmüller)." *CR* 14: 148–53.
- Burzacchini, G. 1986. "Meleagrea." *SOL* 3: 573–86.
- . 1997. "Sul 'canone' delle poetesse (Antip. Thess. AP IX 26 [= XIX G.-P])." *Eikasmos* 8: 125–34.
- Burzachechi, M. 1962. "Oggetti parlanti nelle epigrafi greche." *Epigraphica* 24: 3–54.
- Busch, S. 2002. "Lautes und leises Lesen in der Antike." *RhM* 145: 1–45.
- Bussman, H. 1990. *Lexikon der Sprachwissenschaft*. Stuttgart.
- Cairns, F. 1972. *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*. Edinburgh.
- . 1998. "Asclepiades and the *Hetairai*." *Eikasmos* 9: 165–93.
- Calè, L. 2004. "A Visual Interface for the Act of Reading." Pp. 97–118 in E. Shaffer and A. Brady, eds. *Wolfgang Iser: The Act of Reading and After. Comparative Critical Studies* 1.1–2.
- Calinescu, M. 1993. "Orality and Literacy: Some Historical Paradoxes of Reading." *Yale Journal of Criticism* 6: 174–90.
- Camerarius, J. 1551. *Libellus scholasticus utilis et valde bonus*. Basel.
- Cameron, A. 1993. *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes*. Oxford.
- . 1995. *Callimachus and His Critics*. Princeton.
- Campbell, D. A. 1982–93. *Greek Lyric*. 5 vols. Cambridge.
- Capasso, M. 2003. *Il ritorno di Cornelio Gallo. Il papiro di Qasr Ibrim venticinque anni dopo. Con un contributo di Paolo Radiciotti*. Naples.
- Carilli, M. 1975. "Le *nugae* di Catullo e l'epigramma greco." *ASNP* 5: 925–53.
- Carney, E. D. 1987. "The Reappearance of Royal Sibling Marriage in Ptolemaic Egypt." Pp. 42: 420–39.

- Carper, T. R. 1974. "Dating Gray's Translations from the Greek Anthology." *Notes and Queries* 21: 255–6.
- Cassio, A. C. 1973. "Le note del Poliziano all' 'Antologia Greca'." *IMU* 16: 272–87.
- . 1975. "Un uso di ὄντως, ἀληθῶς, vere, e due epigrammi dell' *Antologia Palatina* (11,78 e 394)." *RFIC* 3: 136–43.
- . 1993. "Iperdorismi callimachei e testo antico dei lirici (Call. *Hy.* 5, 109; 6, 136)." Pp. 903–10 in R. Pretagostini, ed. *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all'età ellenistica. Scritti in onore di Bruno Gentili*. Rome.
- . 1994. "I distici del *polyandron* di Ambracia e l' 'io anonimo' nell'epigramma greco." *SMEA* 33: 101–17.
- Casson, L. 1974. *Travel in the Ancient World*. Toronto.
- Cataudella, Q. 1956. "Theognidea, 903–930." *RhM* 99: 40–6.
- . 1972. *Intorno ai lirici greci*. Rome.
- Caudelier, P. 1984. "Comment Anacréon mourut-il?" *REG* 97: 531–3.
- Cavallini, E. 1991. "Due poetesse greche." Pp. 97–135 in F. De Martino, ed. *Rose di Pieria*. Bari.
- Cavallo, G. 1994. "Discorsi sul libro." Pp. 613–47 in G. Cambiano, L. Canfora, and D. Lanza, eds. *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, vol. 1.3, *La produzione e la circolazione del testo. I Greci e Roma*. Rome.
- Cazzaniga, I. 1970. "Critica testuale ed esegesi a Nosside *A.P.* VII 718." Pp. 25: 431–45.
- Celtis, K. 1963 [1881]. *Fünf Bücher Epigramme*. ed. Karl Hartfelder. Hildesheim [Berlin].
- Chamard, H. 1939–40. *Histoire de la Pléiade*. 4 vols. Paris.
- Chamberlain, C. 1984. "From 'Haunts' to 'Character': The Meaning of Ethos and Its Relation to Ethics." *Helios* 11: 97–108.
- Chamoux, F. 2001. "Les épigrammes dans Pausanias." Pp. 79–91 in D. Knoepfler and M. Piérart, eds. *Éditer, traduire, commenter Pausanias en l'an 2000*. Geneva.
- Chartier, R., and Cavallo, G. 1999. *Die Welt des Lesens. Von der Schriftrolle zum Bildschirm*. Frankfurt a. M.
- Chesterfield, P. D. S., Earl of. 1932. *Letters*. ed. B. Dobrée. 6 vols. London.
- Chiesara, M. L. 2001. *Aristocles of Messene: Testimonia and Fragments*. Oxford.
- Chirico, M. L. 1981. "Antipatro Sidonio interprete di Anacreonte." *AFLN* 23: 43–57.
- Christ, G. 1941. *Simonidesstudien*. Freiburg.
- Christ, W. 1896. *Pindari carmina cum deperditorum fragmentis selectis*. Leipzig.
- Cichorius, C. 1922. "Römisches aus der griechischen Anthologie." Pp. 294–375 in C. Cichorius. *Römische Studien: Historisches Epigraphisches Literaturgeschichtliches aus vier Jahrhunderten Roms*. Leipzig.
- Citroni, M. 1995. *Poesia e lettori in Roma antica*. Rome.
- . 2003a. "I canoni di autori antichi: alle origini del concetto di classico." Pp. 1–22 in *Culture europee e tradizione latina (Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi, Cividale del Friuli, 16–17 novembre 2001)*. Trieste.
- . 2003b. "Marziale, Plinio il giovane e il problema dell'identità di genere dell'epigramma latino." Pp. 7–29 in F. Bertini, ed. *III Giornate Filologiche 'Francesco Della Corte'*. Genoa.
- Citti, V. 1978–9. "Imitazioni da Saffo in Meleagro." *AIV* 137: 333–54.
- Clack, J. 1999. *Asclepiades of Samos and Leonidas of Tarentum: The Poems*. Wauconda, Ill.
- Claes, P. 1996. "La concaténation comme principe de composition chez Catulle." *LEC* 64: 163–70.
- . 2002. *Concatenatio Catulliana: A New Reading of the Carmina*. Amsterdam.
- Clairmont, C. 1970. *Gravestone and Epigram: Greek Memorials from the Archaic and Classical Periods*. Mainz am Rhein.
- Clay, D. 1983. "Individual and Community in the First Generation of the Epicurean

- School." Pp. 255–79 in *ΣΥΖΗΤΗΣΙΣ: Studi sull'epicureismo greco e romano offerti a Marcello Gigante*. vol. 1. Naples.
- . 1986. "The Cults of Epicurus." *CErc* 16: 11–28.
- . 2004. *Archilochos Heros: The Cult of Poets in the Greek Polis*. Cambridge.
- Clayman, D. L. 1980. *Callimachus' Iambi*. Leiden.
- CLE. Buecheler, F., and Lommatsch, E., eds. 1896–1930. *Carmina Latina epigraphica*. 3 vols. Leipzig (1st vol. ed. by F. B., 1896, reiss. by E. L., 1930; 2nd vol. ed. by F. B., 1897; 3rd vol. ed. by E. L.).
- Coiro, A. B. 1988. *Robert Herrick's Hesperides and the Epigram Book Tradition*. Baltimore.
- Colie, R. 1973. *The Resources of Kind: Genre-Theory in the Renaissance*. Berkeley.
- . 1974. *Shakespeare's Living Art*. Princeton.
- Colonna, A., ed. 1951. *Himerius, Declamationes et Orationes*. Rome.
- Conca, F., and Zanetto, G., eds. 2006. *L'epigramma greco: problemi e prospettive (Congresso Nazionale della Consulta Universitaria del Greco: Milano, Università di Milano, 21 ottobre 2005)*. Milan.
- Conte, G. B. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*. ed. C. Segal. Ithaca.
- Conti Bizzarro, F. 2001. "Note alle testimonianze su Erinna." *Vichiana* n.s. 4.3: 101–6.
- Cook, E. 1919. *More Literary Recreations*. London.
- Copley, F. O. 1956. *Exclusus Amator: A Study in Latin Love Poetry*. Baltimore.
- Corso, A. 1994. "La vacca di Mirone." *NAC* 23: 49–91.
- Corts, T. 1968. "The Derivation of Ethos." *Speech Monographs* 35: 201–2.
- Costanza, S. 1930. *Risonanze dell'ode di Sappho ΕΙΝΕΤΑΙ ΜΟΙ ΚΕΝΟΣ da Pindaro a Catullo e Orazio*. Messina.
- Cougny, E. 1927. *Epigrammatum Anthologia Palatina, cum Planudeis et appendice nova epigrammatum veterum ex libris et marmoribus*. vol. 3. Paris.
- Courtney, E., ed. 1993. *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Oxford.
- , ed. 1995. *Musa lapidaria*. Atlanta.
- Cozzoli, A.-T. 2003. "Sositeo e il nuovo dramma satiresco." Pp. 265–91 in A. Martina, ed. *Teatro greco postclassico e teatro latino: Teorie e prassi drammatica (Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Roma 16–18 ottobre 2001)*. Rome.
- Cresci, L. R. 1979. "Studi su alcuni epigrammi sepolcrali di Dioscoride." *Maia* 31: 247–57.
- Cribiore, R. 1996. *Writing, Teachers and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. Atlanta.
- Criscuolo, L. 2003. "Agoni e politica alla corte di Alessandria: Riflessioni su alcuni epigrammi di Posidippo." *Chiron* 33: 311–33.
- Crome, J. F. 1935–6. "ἸΠΠΑΡΧΕΙΟΙ ΕΡΜΑΙ." *MDAI(A)* 60–1: 300–13.
- Crosby, J. O. 1966. "Quevedo, the Greek Anthology, and Horace." *Romance Philology* 19: 435–49.
- Cugusi, P., ed. 2003. *Carmina Latina epigraphica provinciae Sardiniae*. Bologna.
- . 2004. "Carmina Latina epigraphica e novellismo. Cultura di centro e cultura di provincia: contenuti e metodologia di ricerca." *MD* 53: 125–72.
- Curran, L. C. 1966. "Gellius and the Lover's Pallor: A Note on Catullus LXXX." *Arion* 5: 24–7.
- Curtius, E. R. 1953. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. trans. W. R. Trask. Princeton.
- D'Alessio, G. B. 1995a. "Sull'epigramma dal polyandron di Ambracia." *ζPE* 106: 22–6.
- . 1995b. "Una via lontana dal cammino degli uomini (Parm. fr. 1+6 D.-K.; Pind. *Ol.* VI 22–27; pae. VIIb 10–20)." *SIFC* 13: 143–81.
- , ed. 1997. *Callimaco*. 2 vols. 2nd ed. Milan.
- . 2004. "Some Notes on the Salmakis Inscription." Pp. 43–57 in S. Isager and P. Pedersen, eds. *The Salmakis Inscription and Hellenistic Halikarnassos*. Odense.

- Dagnini, I. 1986. "Elementi saffici e motivi tradizionali in Theocr. *Id.* XVIII." *QUCC* 53: 39–54.
- Dagron, G., Feissel, D., et al. 1987. *Inscriptions de Cilicie*. Paris.
- Dahlmann, H. 1963. *Studien zu Varro 'De poetis'*. Wiesbaden.
- . 1981. "Das Rosciusepigramm des Q. Lutatius Catulus." *Gymnasium* 88: 24–44.
- Daly, L. W. 1975. "Callimachea." *GRBS* 16: 399–402.
- Davies, J. K. 1971. *Athenian Propertied Families, 600–300 B.C.* Oxford.
- Davies, M. 2000. "'At fixus nostris tu dabis supplicium': Catullus 116 as an 'inverted dedication'." *Prometheus* 26: 41–6.
- Davies, P. J. E. 2000. *Death and the Emperor: Roman Imperial Funerary Monuments from Augustus to Marcus Aurelius*. Cambridge.
- Dawson, C. 1950. "The Iambi of Callimachus: A Hellenistic Poet's Experimental Laboratory." *TCS* 11: 1–168.
- Day, A. A. 1938. *The Origins of Latin Love Elegy*. Oxford.
- Day, J. W. 1989. "Rituals in Stone: Early Greek Grave Epigrams and Monuments." *JHS* 109: 16–28.
- . 1994. "Interactive Offerings: Early Greek Dedicatory Epigrams and Ritual." *HSPH* 96: 37–74.
- . 2000. "Epigram and Reader. Generic Force as (Re-)Activation of Ritual." Pp. 37–57, 248–54 in M. Depew and D. Obbink, eds. *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*. Cambridge, Mass.
- De Martino, F. and Vox, O., eds. 1996. *Lirica Greca*. 3 vols. Bari.
- De Stefani, C. 2005. "Posidippo e Leonida di Taranto: spunti per un confronto." Pp. 147–90 in M. Di Marco, B. M. Palumbo Stracca, and E. Lelli, eds. *Posidippo e gli altri: Il poeta, il genere, il contesto culturale e letterario. Atti dell'incontro di studio, Roma, 14–15 maggio 2004. Appunti Romani di Filologia* 6, 2004. Pisa.
- Defreyne, L. 1993. "Erotes and Eros in the Epigrams of Asclepiades." *Aevum(ant)* 6: 199–236.
- Degani, E. 1973. "Note sulla fortuna di Archiloco e di Ipponatte in epoca ellenistica." *QUCC* 16: 79–104.
- . 1984 [repr. 2002]. *Studi su Ipponatte*. Bari [repr. Hildesheim].
- . 1991. *Hipponax. Testimonia et Fragmenta*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart.
- . 1993. "L'epigramma." Pp. I.2.197–233 in G. Cambiano, L. Canfora and D. Lanza, eds. *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*. Rome.
- . 1995. "Ipponatte e i poeti filologi." *Aevum(ant)* 8: 105–36.
- . 1997. "Epigramm." *Der Neue Pauly* 3: cc. 1108–12. Stuttgart.
- Del Hoyo, J. 2002. "La ordinatio in los *CLE Hispaniae*." Pp. 143–61 in J. Del Hoyo and J. Gómez Pallarès, eds. *Asta ac pellege. 50 años de la publicación de Inscripciones Hispanas en verso, de S. Mariner*. Madrid.
- Del Re, R. 1931. "Gli epigrammi di Platone." *Athenaeum* 9: 496–541.
- . 1955. "Marco Argentario." *Maia* 7: 184–215.
- Della Corte, F. 1950. *Saffo. Storia e leggenda*. Turin.
- Demos, M. 1999. *Lyric Quotation in Plato*. Lanham.
- Depew, M. 1997. "Reading Greek Prayers." *CLAnt* 16: 229–58.
- . 2000. "Enacted and Represented Dedications: Genre and Greek Hymn." Pp. 59–79, 254–63 in M. Depew and D. Obbink, eds. *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*. Cambridge, Mass.
- . 2004. "Gender, Power, and Poetics in Callimachus' Book of *Hymns*." Pp. 117–37 in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, G. C. Wakker, eds. *Callimachus II*. Leuven.
- Depew, M. and Obbink, D., eds. 2000. *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Derderian, K. 2001. *Leaving Words to Remember: Greek Mourning and the Advent of Literacy*. Leiden.
- Derow, P. 1994. "Historical Exploration: Polybios and His Predecessors." Pp. 73–90 in S. Hornblower, ed. *Greek Historiography*. Oxford.

- Dettori, E. 2000. *Filata grammatica. Testimonianze e frammenti*. Rome.
- Di Benedetto, V. 1982. "Sulla biografia di Saffo." *SCO* 32: 217–30.
- . 2001. "Catullo tra folklore e letteratura." *RCCM* 43: 75–82.
- . 2003. "Omero, Saffo e Orazio e il nuovo Posidippo." *Prometheus* 29: 1–16.
- Di Marco, M. 1997a. "Nihil est amor: Asclepiade, *AP* 12, 50 (= 16 G.-P)." Pp. 161–9 in A. Degl' Innocenti and G. Moretti, eds. *Miscillo flamine: studi in onore di Carmelo Rapisarda*. Trent.
- . 1997b. "Un motivo dell epigramma funebre in Sofocle (*Ai.* 845–51)." *MD* 38: 143–52.
- Di Marco, M., Palumbo Stracca, B. M., and Lelli, E., eds. 2005. *Posidippo e gli altri: Il poeta, il genere, il contesto culturale e letterario. Atti dell'incontro di studio, Roma, 14–15 maggio 2004*. *ARF* 6, 2004. Pisa.
- Di Tillio, Z. 1969. "Confronti formulari e lessicali tra le iscrizioni esametriche ed elegiache dal VII al V sec. a. C. e l'epos arcaico: I. Iscrizioni sepolcrali." *QUCC* 7: 45–73.
- Díaz de Cerio, M. 1999. "Estructura discursiva en el epigrama funerario: la evolución de un género." *Habis* 30: 189–204.
- Dickie, M. 1998. "Poets as Initiates in the Mysteries: Euphorion, Philicus and Posidippus." *AG&A* 44: 49–77.
- Diels, H. 1901. *Poetarum philosophorum fragmenta*. Berlin.
- Dietze, W. 1972. "Abriss einer Geschichte des deutschen Epigramms." Pp. 247–391 and 525–88 in W. Dietze. *Erbe und Gegenwart*. Berlin.
- Dihle, A., ed. 1968. *L'Épigramme Grecque*. Vandoeuvres-Geneva.
- Dinter, M. 2005. "Epic and Epigram: Minor Heroes in Virgil's Aeneid." *CQ* 55: 153–69.
- Dittmar, A. 1886. *De Meleagri Macedonii Leontii re metrica*. Diss. Königsberg.
- Doherty, L. E. 1995. *Siren Songs: Gender, Audiences and Narrators in the Odyssey*. Ann Arbor.
- Dominicy, M. 2002. "Une analyse poétique de Catulle 75." Pp. 171–82 in P. Defosse, ed. *Hommage à Carl Deroux*. Brussels.
- Donohue, A. A. 1997. "The Greek Images of the Gods: Considerations on Terminology and Methodology." *Hephaistos* 15: 31–45.
- Dörrie, H. 1972. "Alcuni riflessi saffici." Pp. 235–242 in *Studi in onore di Q. Cataudella*. II. Catania.
- Downey, G. 1959. "Ekphrasis." *RAC* 4: 921–44.
- Drachmann, A. B. 1903–27 [repr. 1964]. *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina*. Leipzig [Amsterdam].
- Du Bellay, J. 1966. *La Deffence et illustration de la langue Françoyse*. ed. H. Chamard. Paris.
- Dübner, F. 1871–90. *Epigrammatum Anthologia Palatina cum Planudeis et appendice nova epigrammatum veterum ex libris et marmoribus ductorum*. vols. 1–2. Paris.
- Dyck, A. R. 1987. "The Glossographoi." *HSPH* 91: 119–60.
- Ebeling, H. 1885 [repr. 1987]. *Lexicon Homericum*. Leipzig [Hildesheim].
- Ebert, J. 1972. *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen*. Berlin.
- Ecker, U. 1990. *Grabmal und Epigramm: Studien zur frühgriechischen Sepulkraldichtung*. Stuttgart.
- Eco, U. 1990. *The Limits of Interpretation*. Indianapolis.
- Edmonds, J. M. 1922. "Sappho's book as depicted on attic vase." *CQ* 16: 5–14.
- Edmunds, L. 2001. *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry*. Baltimore.
- Elliger, W. 1975. *Die Darstellung der Landschaft in der griechischen Dichtung*. Berlin.
- Elmer, D. F. 2005. "Helen Epigrammatopoiis." *CLAnt* 24: 1–39.
- Elsner, J. 1996. "Image and Ritual: Reflections on the Religious Appreciation of Classical Art." *CQ* n.s. 46: 515–31.
- . 2000. "Between Mimesis and Divine Power: Visuality in the Greco-Roman

- World." Pp. 45–69 in R. S. Nelson, ed. *Visuality before and beyond the Renaissance: Seeing as Others Saw*. Cambridge.
- Endt, J. 1909. *Adnotationes super Lucanum*. Stuttgart.
- Erbse, H. 1953. "Homerscholien und hellenistische Glossare bei Apollonios Rhodios." *Hermes* 81: 163–96.
- . 1998. "Zu den Epigrammen des Simonides." *RhM* 141: 213–30.
- Esposito, E. 2005. "Posidippo, Eronda e l'arte tolemaica." Pp. 191–202 in M. Di Marco, B. M. Palumbo Stracca, and E. Lelli, eds. *Posidippo e gli altri: Il poeta, il genere, il contesto culturale e letterario. Atti dell'incontro di studio, Roma, 14–15 maggio 2004. Appunti Romani di Filologia* 6, 2004. Pisa.
- Esrock, E. J. 1994. *The Readers' Eye: Visual Imaging as Reader Response*. Baltimore.
- Falivene, M. R. 1981. "Il codice di Δίκη nella poesia alessandrina (alcuni epigrammi dell'Antologia Palatina: Callimaco Teocrito Filodemo Fragmentum Grenfellianum)." *QUCC* 37: 87–104.
- Fantuzzi, M. 1997. "Ekphrasis." *DNP* 3: 942–5.
- . 2000. "Convenzioni epigrafiche e mode epigrammatiche: l'esempio delle tombe senza nome." Pp. 127–37 in R. Pretagostini, ed. *La Letteratura ellenistica. Problemi e prospettive di ricerca*. Rome.
- . 2002. "La tecnica versificatoria del P.Mil. Vogl. VIII 309." Pp. 79–97 in G. Bastianini and A. Casanova, eds. *Il papiro di Posidippo un anno dopo*. Florence.
- . 2004. "The Structure of the *Hippika* in P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309." Pp. 212–224 in B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou and M. Baumbach, eds. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus*. Washington.
- . 2005. "Posidippus at Court: The Contribution of the 'Ἱπικὰ of P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309 to the Ideology of Ptolemaic Kingship." Pp. 249–68 in K. Gutzwiller, ed. *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*. Oxford.
- . 2006a. "Callimaco, l'epigramma, il teatro." Pp. 69–87 in G. Bastianini and A. Casanova, eds. *Callimaco: cent'anni di papiri*. Florence.
- . 2006b. "'Mescolare il ludico al serio': la poetica di Filico e l'edonismo dei Feaci (SH 980)." Forthcoming in F. Conca, ed. *Atti del Convegno Nazionale della Consulta Universitaria del Greco: L'epigramma greco: problemi e prospettive*. Milan.
- . forthcoming 2007. "Dioscoride e la storia del teatro." In R. Pretagostini and E. Dettori, eds. *La cultura ellenistica: persistenza, innovazione, trasmissione (Atti del Convegno COFIN 2003. Università di Roma, Tor Vergata, 19–21 Sett. 2005)*. Rome.
- Fantuzzi, M., and Hunter, R. 2002. *Muse e modelli. La poesia ellenistica da Alessandro Magno ad Augusto*. Rome.
- . 2004. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Fantuzzi, M., and Sens, A. forthcoming 2006. "The Hexameter of Inscribed Hellenistic Epigram." In M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit and G. C. Wakker, eds. *Beyond the Canon*. Leuven.
- Faraone, C. forthcoming. *The Stanzaic Architecture of Early Greek Elegy*.
- Färber, H. 1936. *Die Lyrik in der Kunsttheorie der Antike*. Munich.
- Fehling, D. 1989. *Herodotus and His "Sources"*. Trowbridge.
- Felson-Rubin, N. 1994. *Regarding Penelope: From Character to Poetics*. Princeton.
- Fenno, J. 2003. "Praxidamas' crown and the omission at Pindar, *Nemean* 6.18." *CQ* 53: 338–46.
- Ferguson, J. 1970. "The Epigrams of Callimachus." *G&R* 17: 64–80.
- Ferguson, J. 1980. *Callimachus*. Boston.
- Finley, M. I. 1983. "The Ancient Historian and his Sources." Pp. 201–14 in E. Gabba, ed. *Tria Corda: Scritti in onore di Arnaldo Momigliano*. Como.
- Firpo, L. 1973. *Girolamo Angeriano*. Naples.
- Fizman, S., ed. 1988. *The Polish Renaissance in its European Context*. Bloomington.
- Fitts, D. 1956. *Poems from the Greek Anthology*. New York.
- Fitzgerald, W. 1995. *Catullan Provocations: Lyric Poetry and the Drama of Position*. Berkeley.

- Flashar, H., ed. 1978. *Le classicisme à Rome*. Vandoeuvres-Geneva.
- Flower, H. I. 1996. *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*. Oxford.
- Foley, H. P., ed. 1993. *Homeric Hymn to Demeter: Translation, Commentary, and Interpretive Essays*. Princeton.
- Foley, J. M. 1991. *Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic*. Bloomington.
- Ford, A. 2003. "From Letters to Literature: Reading the 'Song Culture' of Classical Greece." Pp. 15–37 in H. Yunis, ed. *Written Texts and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.
- Ford, P. J. 1982. *George Buchanan: Prince of Poets*. Aberdeen.
- Forster, E. M. 1961. *Pharos and Pharillon*. New York.
- Fortenbaugh, W. W. 1994. "Theophrastus, the *Characters*, and Rhetoric." Pp. 15–35 in W. Fortenbaugh and D. C. Mirhady, eds. *Peripatetic Rhetoric After Aristotle*. New Brunswick, NJ.
- . 1996. "Aristotle's Accounts of Persuasion through Character." Pp. 147–68 in C. L. Johnstone, ed. *Theory, Text, Context: Issues in Greek Rhetoric and Oratory*. Albany.
- Fortenbaugh, W. W., and Schütrumpf, E., eds. 2000. *Demetrius of Phalerum: Text, Translation and Discussion*. New Brunswick.
- Fortuna, S. 1993. "Sofocle, Sositeo, il dramma satiresco." *Aevum(ant)* 6: 237–49.
- Fowler, A. 1982. *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Cambridge, Mass.
- . 2003. "The Formation of Genres in the Renaissance and After." *New Literary History* 34: 185–200.
- Fowler, B. H. 1983. "The Centaur's Smile: Pindar and the Archaic Aesthetic." Pp. 159–70 in W. G. Moon, ed. *Ancient Greek Art and Iconography*. Madison.
- . 1984. "The Archaic Aesthetic." *AJP* 105: 119–49.
- . 1989. *The Hellenistic Aesthetic*. Madison.
- FPL. Morel, W. ed. 1927. *Fragmenta poetarum Latinorum*. Leipzig. Reiss. by K. Büchner, 1982; reiss. by J. Blänsdorf, 1995.
- Fraenkel, E. 1955. "Vesper adest." *JRS* 45: 1–8.
- . 1960. *Elementi plautini in Plauto*. 2nd ed. rev. Florence.
- . 1961. "Two Poems of Catullus." *JRS* 51: 46–53.
- Franco, C. 1991. "Teocrito di Chio." *Athenaeum* 69: 445–58.
- Fränkel, H. 1915. *De Simmia Rhodio*. Diss. Göttingen.
- Fraser, P. M. 1972. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. 3 vols. Oxford.
- Freedberg, D. 1989. *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response*. Chicago.
- Friedländer, P. 1912. *Johannes von Gaza, Paulus Silentarius und Prokopios von Gaza: Kunstbeschreibungen Justinianischer Zeit*. Leipzig.
- Friedländer, P., and Hoffleit, H. B. 1948. *Epigrammata: Greek Inscriptions in Verse from the Beginnings to the Persian Wars*. Berkeley.
- Fuà, O. 1973. "L'idea dell'opera d'arte "vivente" e la Bucula di Mirone nell'epigramma greco e latino." *RCCM* 15.1: 49–55.
- Fuhrer, T. 1992. *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Chorlyrikern in den Epinikien des Kallimachos*. Basel.
- . 1994. "The question of genre and metre in Catullus' polymetrics." *QUCC* 46: 95–108.
- Fumaroli, M. 2002. *The Poet and the King: Jean de La Fontaine and His Century*. trans. J. M. Todd. Notre Dame.
- Furley, W. D., and Bremer, J. M. 2001. *Greek Hymns: Selected Cult Songs from the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period*. 2 vols. Tübingen.
- Gabathuler, M. 1937. *Hellenistische Epigramme auf Dichter*. St. Gallen.
- Galán Vioque, G. 2001. *Dioscórides, Epigramas*. Huelva.
- Gallavotti, C. 1956. *Saffo e Alceo. Testimonianze e frammenti*. 2 vols. Naples.

- . 1971. "L'epigramma biografico di Nossis come esempio di critica testuale." Pp. 241–50 in *Studi filologici e storici in onore di L. De Falco*. Naples.
- . 1979. *Metri e ritmi nelle iscrizioni greche*. Rome.
- Galletier, E. 1922. *Étude sur la poésie funéraire romaine d'après les inscriptions*. Paris.
- Galli [Calderini], I. G. 1976. "Su un epigramma di Asclepiade [Anth. Pal. V 7 = 9 Gow-Page]." *Vichiana* 5: 192–205.
- . 1982. "Su alcuni epigrammi dell' Antologia Palatina corredati di lemmi alternativi." *AAP* 31: 239–80.
- Gallo, I. 1974. "L'epigramma biografico sui nove lirici e il 'canone' alessandrino." *QUCC* 26: 91–112.
- Gamberale, L. 1982. "Libri e letteratura nel carme 22 di Catullo." *MD* 8: 143–69.
- García, J. F. 2002. "Symbolic Action in the Homeric Hymns: The Theme of Recognition." *ClAnt* 21: 5–39.
- Garrison, D. 1978. *Mild Frenzy: A Reading of the Hellenistic Love Epigram*. Wiesbaden.
- Garulli, V. 2004. "Il nuovo Posidippo ovvero *Wege zum hellenistische Epigramme*." *A&R* 49: 145–61.
- . 2005. "Posidippo e l'epigrafia sepolcrale greca." Pp. 23–46 in M. Di Marco, B. M. Palumbo Stracca, and E. Lelli, eds. *Posidippo e gli altri: Il poeta, il genere, il contesto culturale e letterario. Atti dell'incontro di studio, Roma, 14–15 maggio 2004. Appunti Romani di Filologia* 6, 2004. Pisa.
- Gauly, B. M. 2005. "Poseidipp und das Gedichtbuch." *ZPE* 151: 33–47.
- Geffcken, J. 1896. *Leonidas von Tarent. Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*. Suppl. 23: 1–164. Leipzig.
- . 1916 [repr. 1976]. *Griechische Epigramme*. Heidelberg [repr. Hildesheim].
- Gelzer, T. 1972. "Alte Komödie und hohe lyrik." *MH* 29: 141–52.
- Gentili, B. 1958. *Anacreon*. Rome.
- . 1968. "Epigramma ed elegia." Pp. 37–90 in A. Dihle, ed. *L'Épigramme Grecque*. Vandoeuvres-Geneva.
- . 1979. *Theatrical Performances in the Ancient World: Hellenistic and Early Roman Theatre*. Amsterdam.
- . 1988. *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece: From Homer to the Fifth Century*. trans. A. T. Cole. Baltimore.
- Geoghegan, D. 1979. *The Epigrams, Anyte: A Critical Edition with Commentary*. Rome.
- Georgoudi, S. 1984. "ΖΩΝ ΕΠΙΤΥΜΒΙΑ." *Archaiologia* 11: 36–41.
- . 1988. "La Mer, la mort et les discours des épigrammes funéraires." *AION (Archeol.)* 10: 53–61.
- Gerber, D., ed. 1997. *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*. Leiden.
- . 1999a. *Greek Elegiac Poetry*. Cambridge, Mass.
- . 1999b. *Greek Iambic Poetry*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Gerhard, G. 1909. *Phoinix von Kolophon: Texte und Untersuchungen*. Leipzig.
- Ghisalberti, A. M. 1960–. *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*. 63 vols. to date. Rome.
- Giangrande, G. 1968. "Sympotic Literature and Epigram" Pp. 93–174 in A. Dihle, ed. *L'Épigramme Grecque*. Vandoeuvres-Geneva.
- . 1973a. "Asclépiade, Héracleia, et la lampe." *REG* 86: 319–22.
- . 1973b. "Gli epigrammi alessandrini come arte allusiva." *QUCC* 15: 7–31.
- . 1973c. "Erklärungen hellenistischer Stellen." *GB* 1: 141–8.
- . 1999. "Deux notes de critique textuelle." *AC* 68: 239–42.
- Gigante, M. 1970. *L'ultimo Quasimodo e la poesia greca*. Naples.
- . 1971. *L'edera di Leonida*. Naples.
- . 1995. *Philodemus in Italy: The Books from Herculaneum*. trans. D. Obbink. Ann Arbor.
- . 2002. *Il libro degli epigrammi di Filodemo*. Naples.
- Gigante Lanzara, V. 2003. "Per Arsinoe." *PP* 58: 337–46.
- Giovio, P. 1956–. *Opera*. 9 vols. Rome.

- Gladigow, B. 1985–6. “Präsenz der Bilder—Präsenz der Götter: Kultbilder und Bilder der Götter in der griechischen Religion.” *Visible Religion* 4–5: 114–33.
- . 1990. “Epiphany, Statuette, Kultbild: Griechische Gottesvorstellungen im Wechsel von Kontext und Medium.” *Visible Religion* 7: 98–121.
- Glucker, J. 1973. “Dioscorides, *AP* VII, 411, 2 and Some Related Problems.” *Eranos* 71: 84–94.
- Godwin, J., ed. 1999. *Catullus. The Shorter Poems*. Warminster.
- Gold, B. K., ed. 1982. *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome*. Austin.
- . 1987. *Literary Patronage in Greece and Rome*. Chapel Hill.
- Goldberg, S. M. 1995. *Epic in Republican Rome*. New York.
- . 2005. “The Early Republic: the Beginnings to 90 BC.” Pp. 15–30 in S. Harrison, ed. *A Companion to Latin Literature*. Oxford.
- Goldhill, S. 1991. *The Poet’s Voice*. Cambridge.
- . 1994. “The Naive and Knowing Eye: Ecphrasis and the Culture of Viewing in the Hellenistic World.” Pp. 197–223, 304–9 in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne, eds. *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture*. Cambridge.
- . 2000. “Body/Politics: Is There a History of Reading?” Pp. 89–120 in T. M. Falkner, N. Felson, and D. Konstan, eds. *Contextualising Classics: Ideology, Performance, Dialogue. Essays in Honor of John J. Peradotto*. Lanham.
- Gomme, A. W., et al. 1970. *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*. vol. 4. Oxford.
- Gordon, R. 1979. “The Real and the Imaginary: Production and Religion in the Graeco-Roman World.” *Art History* 2: 5–34.
- Gortan, V. 1972. “Les Épigrammes de Janus Pannonius et le poète Martial.” *Acta Literaria Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 14: 359–65.
- Gow, A. S. F. 1950. *Theocritus*. 2 vols. Cambridge.
- . 1952. *Theocritus*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Cambridge.
- . 1954. “Antipater of Sidon: Notes and Queries.” *CR* 4: 1–6.
- . 1958a. *The Greek Anthology: Sources and Ascriptions*. London.
- . 1958b. “Leonidas of Tarentum.” *CQ* 8: 113–23.
- . 1966. “Antipater of Thessalonica: Notes and Queries,” *CR* n.s. 16: 5–9.
- Gow, A. S. F. and Page, D. L. 1965. *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*. 2 vols. Cambridge.
- . 1968. *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip*. 2 vols. Cambridge.
- Gow, A. S. F. and Schofield, A. F. 1953. *Nicander. The Poems and Poetical Fragments*. Cambridge.
- Graf, F. 1995. “Ekphrasis: Die Entstehung der Gattung in der Antike.” Pp. 43–155 in G. Boehm and H. Pfotenhauer, eds. *Beschreibungskunst—Kunstbeschreibung: Ekphrasis von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*. Munich.
- Grafton, A. 1983–93. *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*. 2 vols. Oxford.
- Granarolo, J. 1971. *D’Ennius à Catulle*. Paris.
- . 1973. “L’époque néoterique ou la poésie romaine d’avant-garde au dernier siècle de la République (Catulle excepté).” *ANRW* 1.3: 278–360. Berlin.
- . 1978. “Catulle ou la hantise du moi.” *Latomus* 37: 368–86.
- Gray, T. 1966. *The Complete Poems of Thomas Gray, English, Latin and Greek*. ed. H. W. Starr and J. R. Hendrickson. Oxford.
- . 1969. *The Poems of Gray, Collins, and Goldsmith*. ed. R. Lonsdale. London.
- Green, P. 1990. *Alexander to Actium: The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age*. Berkeley.
- Greene, E. 2000. “Playing with Tradition: Gender and Innovation in the Epigrams of Anyte.” *Helios* 27: 15–32.
- . 2005. “Playing with Tradition: Gender and Innovation in the Epigrams of Anyte.” Pp. 137–157 in Ellen Greene, ed. *Women Poets in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Norman, Oklahoma.

- Greene, T. M. 1982. *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry*. New Haven.
- Griessmair, E. 1966. *Das Motiv der Mors Immatura in den griechischen metrischen Grabinschriften*. Innsbruck.
- Griffin, J. 1980. *Homer on Life and Death*. Oxford.
- Griffiths, A. H. 1970a. Review of Gow-Page (1968). *JHS* 90: 216–9.
- . 1970b. “Six Passages in Callimachus and the Anthology.” *BICS* 19: 32–43.
- Griffiths, M. 2001. “Antigone and Her Sister(s): Emboying Women in Greek Tragedy.” Pp. 117–136 in A. Lardinois and L. McClure, eds. *Making Silence Speak: Women’s Voices in Greek Literature and Society*. Princeton.
- Grilli, A. and Simon, A., eds., 2001. *L’officina del teatro europeo*. 2 vols. Pisa.
- Gronewald, M. 1975. “Theognis 255 und *Pap.Oxy.* 2380.” *ZPE* 19: 178.
- Guichard, L. A. 2000. “Intertextualidad y antologación en la Corona de Meleagro.” Pp. 105–19 in V. Bécaries Botas, ed., *Intertextualidad en las literaturas griega y latina*. Madrid.
- . 2004. *Asclepiades de Samos: Epigramas y fragmentos*. Bern.
- . 2005. “Dialecto y género literario en los epigramas de Posidipo (*PMil. Vogl.* VIII 309).” Pp. 311–20 in *Actas del XI congreso de la Sociedad Española de Estudios Clásicos*. 2. Madrid.
- Guidorizzi, G. 1992. *Epigrammi. Meleagro*. Milan.
- Gutzwiller, K. J. 1992a. “Antye’s Epigram Book.” *Syll Class* 4: 71–89.
- . 1992b. “Callimachus’ *Lock of Berenice*: Fantasy, Romance, and Propaganda.” *AJPh* 113: 359–85.
- . 1992c. “The Nautilus, the Halcyon, and Selenai: Callimachus’ Epigram 5 Pf. = 14 G.-P.” *CLAnt* 11: 194–209.
- . 1995. “Cleopatra’s Ring.” *GRBS* 36: 383–98.
- . 1996. “The Evidence for Theocritean Poetry Books.” Pp. 119–138 in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker, eds. *Theocritus*. Groningen.
- . 1997a. “Genre Development and Gendered Voices in Nossis and Erinna.” Pp. 202–22 in Y. Prins and M. Shreiber, eds. *Dwelling in Possibility: Women Poets and Critics on Poetry*. Ithaca.
- . 1997b. “The Poetics of Editing in Meleager’s *Garland*.” *TAPhA* 127: 169–200.
- . 1998a. “Meleager: from Menippean to Epigrammatist.” Pp. 81–93 in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit and G. C. Wakker, eds. *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*. Groningen.
- . 1998b. *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*. Berkeley.
- . 2002a. “Art’s Echo: The Tradition of Hellenistic Ecphrastic Epigram.” Pp. 85–112 in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker, eds. *Hellenistic Epigrams*. Leuven.
- . 2002b. “Posidippus on Statuary.” Pp. 41–59 in G. Bastianini and A. Casanova, eds. *Il papiro di Posidippo un anno dopo*. Florence.
- . 2003. “Visual Aesthetics in Meleager and Cavafy.” *CML* 23.2: 67–87.
- . 2004a. “A New Hellenistic Poetry Book: *PMil.Vogl.* VIII 309.” Pp. 84–93 in B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou and M. Baumbach, eds. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves. Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (PMil.Vogl. VIII 309)*. Washington.
- . 2004b. “Seeing Thought: Timomachus’ Medea and Ecphrastic Epigram.” *AJPh* 125: 339–86.
- . 2005a. “Introduction.” Pp. 1–16 in K. J. Gutzwiller, ed. *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*. Oxford.
- . 2005b. “The Literariness of the Milan Papyrus, or ‘What Difference a Book?’” Pp. 287–319 in K. J. Gutzwiller, ed. *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*. Oxford.
- . ed. 2005c. *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*. Oxford.

- . forthcoming 2007. "Heroic Epitaphs of the Classical Age: The Aristotelian *Peplos* and Beyond." In M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic, and I. Petrovic, eds. *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*.
- Haan, E. 2000. *Thomas Gray's Latin Poetry: Some Classical, Neo-Latin, and Vernacular Contexts*. Brussels.
- Hackforth, R. 1952. *Plato's Phaedrus*. Cambridge.
- Hagen, H.-M. 1966. *Ἡθοποιία: Zur Geschichte eines rhetorischen Begriffs*. In Diss. Erlangen-Nuremberg.
- Hagstrum, J. H. 1958. *The Sister Arts. The Tradition of Literary Pictorialism and English Poetry from Dryden to Gray*. Chicago.
- Hague, R. H. 1983. "Ancient Greek Wedding Songs: The Tradition of Praise." *Journal of Folklore Research* 20: 131–43.
- Handsworth, B. 1993. *The Iliad, a Commentary. Books 9–12*. Cambridge.
- Handley, E. W. 1996. "Two Epigrams by Asclepiades (XXV, XVI G.-P)." *MH* 53: 140–7.
- Hansen, B. 1914. *De Leonida Tarentino*. Weida.
- Hansen, E. 1971. *The Attalids of Pergamon*. 2nd ed. Ithaca.
- Hansen, P. A. 1978. "DAA 374–5 and the Early Elegiac Epigram." *Glotta* 56: 195–201.
- . 1983–9. *Carmina epigraphica graeca*. 2 vols. Berlin.
- Harder, M. A. 2003. "The Invention of Past, Present and Future in Callimachus' *Aetia*." *Hermes* 131: 290–306.
- Harder, M. A., Regtuit, R. F., and Wakker, G. C., eds. 2002. *Hellenistic Epigrams*. Leuven.
- Harder, R. 2001. "Polixene." *Der neue Pauly* 10: 83–4.
- Hardie, A. 1983. *Statius and the Silvae: Poets, Patrons and Epideixis in the Graeco-Roman World*. Liverpool.
- . 2003. "The Statue(s) of Philitas (PMil.Vogl.VIII 309 Col. X. 16–25 and Hermesianax fr. 7, 75–78 P)." *ZPE* 143: 27–36.
- Hardie, P. R. 1985. "Imago Mundi: Cosmological and Ideological Aspects of the Shield of Achilles." *JHS* 105: 11–31.
- Harington, J. 1926. *The Epigrams of Sir John Harington*. ed. N. E. McClure. Philadelphia.
- Harrauer, H. 1981. "Epigrammincipit auf einem Papyrus aus dem 3. Jh. v. Chr. P. Vindob G 40611: Ein Vorbericht." Pp. 49–53 in R. S. Bagnall, et al., eds. *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Congress of Papyrology*. Chico.
- Harrell, S. E. 1998. "Dedication and Poetry at Delphi: Bacchylides *Ode Three*." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Philological Association, 29 December.
- Harrison, T. 1975. *Palladas: Poems*. London.
- Hartigan, K. 1979. *The Poets and the Cities: Selections from the Anthology about Greek Cities*. Meisenheim am Glan.
- Häusle, H. 1979a. *Einfache und frühe Formen des griechischen Epigramms*. Innsbruck.
- . 1979b. *ΖΩΟΠΟΙΕΙΝ-ΥΦΙΣΤΑΝΑΙ: Eine Studie der frühgriechischen inschriftlichen Ich-Rede der Gegenstände*. *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft* 20: 23–139.
- . 1980. *Das Denkmal als Garant des Nachruhms. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Thematik eines Motivs in lateinischen Inschriften*. Munich.
- Hausmann, F. R. 1972. "Untersuchungen zum neulateinischen Epigramm Italiens im Quattrocento." *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 21: 1–35.
- Hauvette, A. 1896. *De l'authenticité des épigrammes de Simonide*. Paris.
- Hazzard, R. A. 2000. *Imagination of a Monarchy: Studies in Ptolemaic Propaganda*. Toronto.
- Hebert, B. D. 1989. *Schriftquellen zur Hellenistischen Kunst. Plastik, Malerei und Kunsthandwerk der Griechen vom vierten bis zum zweiten Jahrhundert*. Graz.
- Hedrick, C. 1999. "Democracy and the Athenian Epigraphical Habit." *Hesperia* 68.3: 387–439.

- Heffernan, J. A. W. 1993. *Museum of Words: The Poetics of Ekphrasis from Homer to Ashbery*. Chicago.
- Hemelrijk, E. A. 1999. *Matrona Docta: Educated Women in the Roman Elite from Cornelia to Julia Domna*. London.
- Henkel, A., and Schöne, A. 1967–76. *Emblemata: Handbuch zur Sinnbildkunst des XVI. und XVII. Jahrhunderts*. Stuttgart.
- Henrichs, A. 1996. “Warum soll ich denn tanzen?": Dionysisches im Chor der griechischen Tragödie. Stuttgart.
- . 2003. “Writing Religion: Inscribed Texts, Ritual Authority, and the Religious Discourse of the Polis.” Pp. 38–58 in H. Yunis, ed. *Written Texts and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.
- Hense, O. 1909. *Teletis reliquiae*. 2nd ed. Tübingen.
- Herder, J. G. 1877–1913. *Sämmtliche Werke*. ed. B. Suphan. 33 vols. Berlin.
- Herington, C. J. 1985. *Poetry into Drama: Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition*. Berkeley.
- Hesberg, H. von. 1981. “Bemerkungen zu Architekturepigrammen des 3. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.” *JDAI* 96: 55–119.
- . 1988. “Bildsyntax und Erzählweise in der hellenistischen Flächenkunst.” *JDAI* 103: 309–65.
- Heubeck, A., and Hoekstra, A. 1989. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey: Books IX–XVI*. Oxford.
- Hicks, E. L. 1882. “On the Characters of Theophrastus.” *JHS* 3: 128–43.
- Hicks, R. D. 1962. *Stoic and Epicurean*. New York.
- Higbie, C. 1999. “Craterus and the Use of Inscriptions in Ancient Scholarship.” *TAPhA* 129: 43–83.
- Hiller, E. 1889. “Zu den simonideischen Epigrammen.” *Philologus* 48: 229–47.
- Hiller von Gaertringen, F. 1926. *Historische griechische Epigramme*. Bonn.
- Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Hinks, R. P. 1939. *Myth and Allegory in Ancient Art*. London.
- Hinman, W. S. 1935. *Literary Quotation and Allusion in the Rhetoric, Poetics and Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle*. Staten Island.
- Hoffmann, E. 1893. *Sylloge epigrammatum graecorum quae ante medium saeculum a. Chr. n. tertium incisa ad nos pervenerunt*. Halle.
- Hollis, A. S., ed. 1990. *Callimachus. Hecale*. Oxford.
- Holst-Warhaft, G. L. 1992. *Dangerous Voices: Women's Laments and Greek Literature*. London.
- Holzberg, N. 2004. “Impersonating Young Virgil: The Author of the Catalepton and his *libellus*.” *MD* 52: 29–40.
- Hopkinson, N. 1988. *A Hellenistic Anthology*. Cambridge.
- Hornblower, S. 1987. *Thucydides*. London.
- . 2002. “Herodotus and His Sources of Information.” Pp. 373–86 in E. J. Bakker, I. J. F. De Jong, and H. Van Wees, eds. *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*. Leiden.
- . 2004. *Thucydides and Pindar: Historical Narrative and the World of Epinikian Poetry*. Oxford.
- Hose, M. 1997. “Der alexandrinische Zeus: Zur Stellung der Dichtkunst im Reich der ersten Ptolemäer.” *Philologus* 141: 46–64.
- How, W. W., and Wells, J. 1928. *A Commentary on Herodotus*. 2 vols. Oxford.
- Hubaux, J. 1930. *Les thèmes bucoliques dans la poésie latine*. Brussels.
- Hudson, H. H. 1947. *The Epigram in the English Renaissance*. Princeton.
- Hunter, R. L. 1985. *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome*. Cambridge.
- . 1992. “Callimachus and Heraclitus.” *MD* 28: 113–23.
- . 1993. *The Argonautica of Apollonius: Literary Studies*. Cambridge.
- . 1996. *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry*. Cambridge.

- . 1997. "(B)ionic man: Callimachus' Iambic Programme." *PCPhS* 43: 41–52.
- . 1999. *Theocritus: A Selection: Idylls 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, and 13*. Cambridge.
- . 2001. "The Poet Unleaved. Simonides and Callimachus." Pp. 242–54 in D. Boedeker and D. Sider, eds. *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*. Oxford.
- . 2003. "Reflecting on Writing and Culture: Theocritus and the Style of Cultural Change." Pp. 213–35 in H. Yunis, ed. *Written Texts and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.
- . 2004a. "Homer and Greek Literature." Pp. 235–53 in R. Fowler, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*. Cambridge.
- . 2004b. "Notes on the Lithika of Posidippus." Pp. 94–104 in B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou, and M. Baumbach, eds. 2004. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (PMil.Vogl. VIII 309)*. Washington.
- . 2005. "Speaking in Glossai: Dialect Choice and Cultural Politics in Hellenistic Poetry." Pp. 187–206 in W. M. Bloomer, ed. *The Contest of Language. Before and Beyond Nationalism*. Notre Dame.
- Hurwit, J. M. 1985. *The Art and Culture of Early Greece, 1100–480 B.C.* Ithaca.
- Hutchinson, G. O. 1988. *Hellenistic Poetry*. Oxford.
- . 2002a. "The New Posidippus and Latin Poetry." *ζPE* 138: 1–10.
- . 2002b. "The Publication and Individuality of Horace's Odes Books 1–3." *CQ* 52: 517–37.
- . 2003. "The Catullan corpus, Greek epigram, and the Poetry of Objects." *CQ* 53: 206–21.
- Hutton, J. 1925. *The Greek Anthology in England*. M.A. thesis Cornell.
- . 1935. *The Greek Anthology in Italy to the Year 1800*. Ithaca.
- . 1941. "Analogues of Shakespeare's Sonnets 153–54: Contributions to the History of a Theme." *Modern Philology* 4: 385–403.
- . 1946. *The Greek Anthology in France and in the Latin Writers of the Netherlands to the Year 1800*. Ithaca.
- Huxley, G. 1972. "On Aristotle's Historical Methods." *GRBS* 13: 157–70.
- . 1973. "Aristotle as Antiquary." *GRBS* 14: 271–86.
- . 1974. "Aristotle's Interest in Biography." *GRBS* 15: 203–13.
- Ihm, S. 2004. *Eros und Distanz: Untersuchungen zu Asklepiades in seinem Kreis*. Munich.
- Ingarden, R. 1972. *Das literarische Kunstwerk*. Tübingen.
- Instinsky, L. 1961. "Alexander Pindar Euripides." *Historia* 10: 248–55.
- Iriarte, J. de. 1769. *Regiae bibliothecae Matritensis codices Graeci mss.* Vol. 1. Madrid.
- Irigoin, J. 1952. *Histoire du texte de Pindare*. Paris.
- Irwin, E. 1998. "Biography, Fiction and the Archilochean ainos." *JHS* 118: 177–83.
- Isager, S. 1998. "The Pride of Halikarnassos: Editio Princeps of an Inscription from Salmakis." *ζPE* 123: 1–23.
- Isager, S., and Pedersen, P. 2004. *The Salmakis Inscription and Hellenistic Halikarnassos*. Odense.
- Iser, W. 1974. *Die Appellstruktur der Texte. Unbestimmtheit als Wirkungsbedingung literarischer Prosa*. Constance.
- . 1978. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore.
- Jacobs, F. 1794–8. *Anthologia graeca sive poetarum graecorum lusus ex recensione Brunckii*. Leipzig.
- . 1813–7. *Anthologia graeca ad fidem codicis olim Palatini nunc Parisini ex apographo Gothano edita*. 3 vols. Leipzig.
- Jacoby, F. 1913. "7) Herodot." *RE* Suppl. II: col. 205–519.
- . 1945. "Some Athenian Epigrams from the Persian Wars." *Hesperia* 14.3: 157–211.
- . 1949. *Atthis: The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens*. Oxford.

- Jacquemin, A. 1995. "Ordre des termes des dedicaces delphiques." *AION* n.s. 2: 141–57.
- Jan, F. de. 1893. *De Callimacho Homeri interprete*. Diss. Strassburg.
- Janus, S. 1991. *De Kunst van Janus Secundus: De "Kussen" en andere gedichten*. ed. J. P. Guépin. Amsterdam.
- . 2000. *The Amatory Elegies of Johannes Secundus*. ed. P. Murgatroyd. Leiden.
- . 2005–. *Œuvres complètes*. ed. R. Guillot. 2 vols. Paris.
- Janko, R. 2000. *Philodemus: On Poems Book One*. Oxford.
- Jay, P., ed. 1981. *The Greek Anthology*. London.
- Jeffery, L. H. 1990. *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*. rev. ed. A. W. Johnston. Oxford.
- Jocelyn, H. D. 1994. "Some observations on Valerius Aedituus ap. Gell. XIX 9, 12." *Eikasmos* 5: 247–50.
- Johnson, S. 1995. *The Latin and Greek Poems of Samuel Johnson*. ed. B. Baldwin. London.
- . 2005. *The Latin Poems*. ed. N. Rudd. Lewisburg.
- Johnson, W. A. 2000. "Toward a Sociology of Reading in Classical Antiquity." *AJPh* 121: 593–627.
- . 2004. *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*. Toronto.
- . 2005. "The Posidippus Papyrus: Bookroll and Reader." Pp. 70–80 in Kathryn Gutzwiller, ed. *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*. Oxford.
- Jones, C. P. 2001. "Pausanias and His Guides." Pp. 33–9 in S. E. Alcock, J. F. Cherry, and J. Elsner eds. *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece*. Oxford.
- Jory, D. H. 1976. "Voltaire and the Greeks." *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 153: 1169–87.
- Jouan, F. 1996. "André Chénier et la poésie grecque classique." Pp. 83–95 in R. Poingnault, ed. *Anniversaires 1994: Présence de l'antiquité chez Grégoire de Tours, François Rabelais, Voltaire, André Chénier, Anatole France, Jean Giraudoux*. Tours.
- Junghahn, A. A. 1869. *De Simonidis Cei Epigrammatis Quaestiones*. Berlin.
- Kägi, P. 1917. *Nachwirkungen der älteren griechischen Elegie in den Epigrammen der Anthologie*. Diss. Zurich.
- Kaibel, G. 1873. "Quaestiones Simonideae." *RhM* 28: 436–60.
- . 1877. "Observationes criticae in Anthologiam Graecam." Pp. 326–36 in *Commentationes philologiae in honorem Theodori Mommseni*. Berlin.
- . 1878 [repr. 1965]. *Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus collecta*. Berlin. [Hildesheim].
- . 1880. "Sententiarum liber primus." *Hermes* 15: 451–64.
- . 1896. "Zu den Epigrammen des Kallimachos." *Hermes* 31: 264–70.
- Karanika, A. 2002. *The Work of Poetry and the Poetics of Work: Women's Performances at Work in Early Greek Literature*. Diss. Princeton.
- Kassel, R. 1983. "Dialog mit Statuen." *ZPE* 51: 1–12.
- Katz, M. A. 1991. *Penelope's Renown: Meaning and Indeterminacy in the Odyssey*. Princeton.
- Kazoknieks, M. 1968. *Studien zur Rezeption der Antike bei russischen Dichtern zu Beginn des XIX. Jahrhunderts*. Munich.
- Keckskeméti, J., ed. 2003. *La France des humanistes: Henri II Estienne, éditeur et écrivain*. Turnhout.
- Keesling, C. M. 2003a. "Rereading the Acropolis Dedications." Pp. 41–54 in D. Jordan and J. Traill, eds. *Lettered Attica: A Day of Attic Epigraphy*. Athens.
- . 2003b. *The Votive Statues of the Athenian Acropolis*. Cambridge.
- Kelly, A. 1974. "The Latin Poetry of Walter Savage Landor." Pp. 150–93 in J. W. Binns, ed. *The Latin Poetry of English Poets*. London.
- Kemp, W., ed. 1992. *Der Betrachter ist im Bild: Kunstwissenschaft und Rezeptionsästhetik*. Berlin.
- Kemper, R. 1975. *Die Redaktion der Epigramme des Celtis*. Kronberg.
- Kennedy, G. A. 1972. *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World, 300 B.C.–A.D. 300*. Princeton.

- Kerkhecker, A. 1997. "Μουσέων ἐν θαλάρῳ—Dichter und Dichtung am Ptolemäerhof." *A&A* 43: 124–44.
- . 1999. *Callimachus' Book of Iambi*. Oxford.
- Kerckhoff, M. 1973. "Zum antiken Begriff des Kairos." *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 27: 256–74.
- Kidwell, C. 1989. *Marullus: Soldier Poet of the Renaissance*. London.
- Kierdorf, W. 1980. *Laudatio funebris. Interpretationen und Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung der römischen Leichenrede*. Meisenheim am Glan.
- Kinneavy, L. L., Eskin, C.R., and Eskin, L.G. 1998. "Kairos." *HWRh* 4: 836–44.
- Kinstrand, J. 1976. *Bion of Borysthenes: A Collection of the Fragments*. Uppsala.
- Kirchhoff, A. 1985. *Thukydides und sein Urkundenmaterial*. Berlin.
- Kirstein, R. 2002. "Companion pieces in the Hellenistic epigram (Call. 21 and 35 Pf.; Theoc. 7 and 15 Gow; Mart. 2.91 and 2.92; Ammianus AP 11.230 and 11.231)." Pp. 113–35 in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit and G. C. Wakker, eds. *Hellenistic Epigrams*. Leuven.
- Kissas, K. 2000. *Die attischen Statuen- und Stelenbasen archaischer Zeit*. Bonn.
- Knauer, O. 1935. *Die Epigramme des Asklepiades von Samos*. Würzburg.
- Knox, B. M. W. 1968. "Silent Reading in Antiquity." *GRBS* 9: 421–41.
- Köhnken, A. 1973. "Schlußpointe und Selbstdistanz bei Kallimachos." *Hermes* 101: 425–41.
- . 1993. "Gattungstypik in kallimacheischen Weihepigrammen." *GB Suppl.* 5 (*Festschrift Walter Pötscher*): 119–30.
- Kolson Hurley, A. 2004. *Catullus*. London.
- Körte, A. and Thierfelder, A. 1959. *Menandri quae supersunt*. vol. 2. Leipzig.
- Kosmetatou, E. 2004a. "Bilistiche and the Quasi-Institutional Status of Ptolemaic Royal Mistress." *APF* 50: 18–36.
- . 2004b. "Constructing Legitimacy: The Ptolemaic *Familiengruppe* as a Means of Self-Definition in Posidippus' *Hippika*." Pp. 225–46 in B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou, and M. Baumbach, eds. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (PMil.Vogl. VIII 309)*. Washington.
- . 2004c. "Vision and Visibility: Art Historical Theory Paints a Portrait of New Leadership in Posidippus' *Andriantopoiika*." Pp. 187–211 in B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou, and M. Baumbach, eds. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (PMil.Vogl. VIII 309)*. Washington.
- Krevans, N. 1984. "The Poet as Editor: Callimachus, Virgil, Horace, Propertius and the Development of the Poetic Book." Diss. Princeton.
- . 2004. "Callimachus and the Pedestrian Muse." Pp. 173–84 in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit and G. C. Wakker, eds. *Callimachus II*. Leuven.
- . 2005. "The Editor's Toolbox: Strategies for Selection and Presentation in the Milan Epigram Papyrus." Pp. 81–96 in K. Gutzwiller, ed. *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*. Oxford.
- Krieger, M. 1995. "Das Problem der Ekphrasis: Wort und Bild, Raum und Zeit und das literarische Werk." Pp. 41–57 in G. Boehm and H. Pfotenbauer, eds. *Beschreibungskunst Kunstbeschreibung: Ekphrasis von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*. Munich.
- Kris, E., and Kurz, O. 1934 [repr. 1995]. *Die Legende vom Künstler: Ein geschichtlicher Versuch*. Vienna [Frankfurt a. M.].
- Kroll, W. 1924 [repr. 1964]. *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur*. Stuttgart.
- Krumeich, R., Pechstein, N., and Seidensticker, B., eds. 1999. *Das griechische Satyrspiel*. Darmstadt.
- Kruschwitz, P., ed. 2002. *Carmina Saturnia epigraphica. Einleitung, Text und Kommentar zu den saturnischen Versinschriften*. Stuttgart.
- Kurke, L. 1991. *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*. Ithaca.
- . 1993. "The Economy of Kudos." Pp. 131–63 in C. Dougherty and L. Kurke, eds. *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics*. Cambridge.

- . 2005. "Choral Lyric as 'Ritualization': Poetic Sacrifice and Poetic *Ego* in Pindar's Sixth Paian." *ClAnt* 24: 81–130.
- Kuttner, A. 2005. "Cabinet Fit for a Queen: The Λιθικά as Posidippus' Gem Museum." Pp. 141–63 in K. Gutzwiller, ed. *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*. Oxford.
- Labarbe, J. 1968a. "Une épigramme sur les neuf lyriques grecs." *AC* 37: 449–66.
- . 1968b. "Les aspects gnomiques de l'épigramme grecque." Pp. 351–86 in A. Dihle, ed. *L'Épigramme Grecque*. Vandoeuvres-Geneva.
- Labellarte, R. 1969. *Leonida di Taranto: antologia di epigrammi*. Bari.
- Lapini, W. 2004. "Posidippo, *Ep.* 110 Austin-Bastianini." *ΣPE* 149: 45–8.
- Lascaris, Giovanni. 1494. Ἀνθολογία διαφόρων ἐπιγραμμάτων ἀρχαίοις συντεθειμένων σοφοῖς ἐπὶ διαφόροις ὑποθέσεσιν ἐρμηνείας ἐχόντων ἐπίδειξιν. Florence.
- Lasserre, F. 1959. "Aux origines de l'Anthologie." *RhM* 102: 222–47, 307–30.
- Latte, K. 1953. "Erinna." *Nachr. Ges. der Wiss. Zu Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Kl.* 3: 79–94.
- Lattimore, R. 1942. *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*. Urbana.
- Lauer, J., and Picard, C. 1955. *Les statues Ptolémaïques du Sarapieion de Memphis*. Paris.
- Laurens, P. 1989. *L'abeille dans l'ambre: Célébration de l'épigramme de l'époque alexandrine à la fin de la Renaissance*. Paris.
- Lausberg, H. 1998. *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*. trans. M. T. Bliss, A. Jansen, and D. E. Orton. ed. D. E. Orton and R. D. Anderson. Leiden.
- Lausberg, M. 1982. *Das Einzeldistichon. Studien zum antiken Epigramm*. Munich.
- Lauxtermann, M. D. 1998. "What is an Epideictic Epigram?" *Mnemosyne* 51: 525–37.
- Lavelle, B. M. 1985. "Hipparchos' Herms." *EMC* 29: 411–20.
- . 1986. "The Dating and Patronage of the Archidike-Epigram." *Hermes* 114: 240–4.
- Lavigne, D. E., and Romano, A. J. 2004. "Reading the Signs. The Arrangement of the New Posidippus Roll (PMil. Vogl. VIII 309, IV.7–VI.8)." *ΣPE* 146: 13–24.
- Lazenby, J. F. 1993. *The Defence of the Greece*. Warminster.
- Lefkowitz, M. 1975. "Pindar's Lives." Pp. 71–93 in P. T. Brannan, ed. *Classica et Iberica. Festschrift in Honor. J.M.F. Marique*. Worcester, Mass.
- . 1978. "The Poet as Hero: Fifth Century Autobiography and Subsequent Biographical Fiction." *CQ* 28: 459–69.
- . 1980. "Autobiographical fiction in Pindar." *HSPH* 84: 29–49.
- . 1981. *The Lives of the Greek Poets*. Baltimore.
- Lehnus, L. 1979. *L'inno a Pan di Pindaro*. Milan.
- . 1989. *Bibliografia callimachea: 1489–1988*. Genoa.
- . 2000. *Nuova bibliografia callimachea: 1489–1998*. Alessandria.
- Lelli, E. 2002. "Arsinoe II in Callimaco e nelle testimonianze letterarie alessandrine (Teocrito, Posidippo, Sotade e altro)." *ARF* 4: 5–29.
- . 2005. "Posidippo e Callimaco." Pp. 77–132 in M. Di Marco, B. M. Palumbo Stracca and E. Lelli, eds. 2005. *Posidippo e gli altri: Il poeta, il genere, il contesto culturale e letterario. Atti dell'incontro di studio, Roma, 14–15 maggio 2004. Appunti Romani di Filologia 6, 2004*. Pisa.
- Lemerle, P. 1971. *Le premier humanisme byzantin: notes et remarques sur enseignement et culture à Byzance des origines au X^e siècle*. Paris.
- Lennartz, K. 1999. "Fliegen oder flattern? Zum Epitaph des Ennius (frg. var. 17f. Vahlen²)." *Philologus* 143: 181–2.
- Lenzinger, F. 1965. *Zur griechischen Anthologie*. Zurich.
- Lessing, G. E. 1771. *Ζεστρευτε Anmerkungen über das Epigramm und einige der vornehmsten Epigrammatisten*. Berlin.
- . 1954–8. *Gesammelte Werke*. 10 vols. ed. P. Rilla. Berlin.
- Levi, D. 1947. *Antioch Mosaic Pavements*. 2 vols. Princeton.
- Levin, D. N. 1962. "Quaestiones Erinneanae." *HSPH* 66: 193–204.
- Lewis, D. M. 1987. "Bowie on Elegy: A Footnote." *JHS* 107: 188.

- Liberman, G. 2002. *Alcée. Fragments*. 2 vols. Paris.
- Lier, B. 1903. "Topica carminum sepulcralium Latinorum." *Philologus* 62: 445–77.
- Lightfoot, J. L. 1999. *Parthenius of Nicaea*. Oxford.
- Lindsay, J. 1968. *Men and Gods on the Roman Nile*. London.
- Lissarrague, F. 1990. *The Aesthetics of the Greek Banquet*. Princeton.
- Lissberger, E. 1934. *Das Fortleben der römischen Elegiker in den carmina epigraphica*. Tübingen.
- Livrea, E. 1986. *Studi Cercidei*. Bonn.
- . 1989. "Teodorida contro Mnascalca." *SCO* 39: 93–9.
- . 1995. "From Pittacus to Byzantium: The History of a Callimachean Epigram." *CQ* 45: 474–80.
- . 2002. "Critica testuale ed esegesi del nuovo Posidippo." Pp. 61–77 in G. Bastianini and A. Casanova, eds. *Il papiro di Posidippo un anno dopo*. Florence.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 1963. "The Seal of Poseidippus." *JHS* 83: 75–99.
- . 1979. Review of B. A. van Groningen, ed. 1977. *Euphorion*. Amsterdam. *CR* 93: 14–7.
- . 1990. *The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones: Greek Comedy, Hellenistic Literature, Greek Religion and Miscellanea*. Oxford.
- . 1999. "The Pride of Halicarnassus." *ZPE* 124: 1–14.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. and Parsons, P., eds. 1983. *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. Berlin.
- Löhr, C. 2000. *Griechische Familienweihungen: Untersuchungen einer Repräsentationsform von ihren Anfängen bis zum Ende des 4. Jhs. v. Chr.* Rahden.
- Long, A. A. 1993. "Hellenistic Ethics and Philosophical Power." Pp. 138–56 in P. Green, ed. *Hellenistic History and Culture*. Berkeley.
- Longo, V. 1967. *L'epigramma scoptico greco*. Genoa.
- Lorau, N. 1987. *Tragic Ways of Killing a Woman*. trans. A. Forster. Cambridge, Mass.
- Lorenz, S. 2004. "Waterscape with Black and White: Epigrams, Cycles, and Webs in Martial's *Epigrammaton Liber Quartus*." *AJPh* 125: 255–78.
- Lougovaya, J. 2004. *An Historical Study of Athenian Verse Epitaphs from the Sixth through the Fourth Centuries B.C.* Diss. Toronto.
- Lowry, M. 1979. *The World of Aldus Manutius: Business and Scholarship in Renaissance Venice*. Ithaca.
- Luck, G. 1954. "Die Dichterinnen der griechischen Anthologie." *MH* 11: 170–87.
- . 1969. *The Latin Love Elegy*. 2nd ed. London.
- Ludwig, W. 1968. "Die Kunst der Variation im hellenistischen Liebesepigramm." Pp. 297–348 in A. Dihle, ed. *L'Épigramme Grecque*. Vandoeuvres-Geneva.
- Lund, R. D. 2003. "The Ghosts of Epigram, False Wit, and the Augustan Mode." *Eighteenth-Century Life* 27.2: 67–95.
- Luppe, W. 2003. "Ein Weih-Epigramm Poseidipps auf Arsinoe." *AFP* 49: 21–4.
- Mace, S. T. 1993. "Amour, Encore! The Development of $\delta\eta\upsilon\tau\epsilon$ in Archaic Lyric." *GRBS* 34: 334–64.
- . 2001. "Utopian and Erotic Fusion in a New Elegy by Simonides." Pp. 185–207 in D. Boedeker and D. Sider, eds. *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*. New York.
- Mackail, J. W. 1890 [1906, 1911]. *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology*. London.
- MacLachlan, B. 1993. *The Age of Grace: Charis in Early Greek Poetry*. Princeton.
- MacMullen, R. 1982. "The Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire." *AJPh* 103: 233–46.
- Magini, D. 2000. "Asclepiade e le origini dell'epigramma erotico." *Acme* 53: 17–37.
- Magnelli, E. 1994. "La poetica di Filodemo epigrammista." *QCTC* 12: 123–31.
- . 1995. "Le norme del secondo piede dell'esametro nei poeti ellenistici e il comportamento della 'parola metrica.'" *MD* 35: 135–64.
- , ed. 1999. *Alexandri Aetoli testimonia et fragmenta*. Florence.
- . 2002. *Studi su Euforione*. Rome.
- . 2005. "Fortuna del nuovo Posidippo nella poesia imperiale." Pp. 217–27 in

- M. Di Marco, B. M. Palumbo Stracca and E. Lelli, eds. 2005. *Posidippo e gli altri: Il poeta, il genere, il contesto culturale e letterario. Atti dell'incontro di studio, Roma, 14-15 maggio 2004. Appunti Romani di Filologia 6, 2004*. Pisa.
- . 2006. "Il proemio della *Corona* di Filippo di Tessalonica e la sua funzione programmatica." Pp. 393-404 in L. Cristante, ed. *Incontri triestini di filologia classica IV (2004-2005)*. Trieste.
- Maltby, R. 1997. "'The Language' of Early Latin Epigram." *Sandalion* 20: 43-56.
- Maltomini, F. 2001. "Nove epigrammi ellenistici rivisitati (PPetrie II 49b)." *ΣPE* 134: 55-66.
- Manakidou, F. 1993. *Beschreibung von Kunstwerken in der hellenistischen Dichtung: Ein Beitrag zur hellenistischen Poetik*. Stuttgart.
- Manning, J. 2002. *The Emblem*. London.
- Männlein-Robert, I. 2004. "Griechische Kunst und römischer Stil—Zum Eurotas-Epigramm des Philipp von Thessalonike (AP IX 709 = GP I 63)." *WJA* 28a: 35-48.
- . forthcoming 2007. *Stimme, Schrift und Bild: Zum Verhältnis der Künste in der hellenistischen Dichtung*. Heidelberg.
- Manoussakas, M. and Staikos, K. 1987. *The Publishing Activity of the Greeks during the Italian Renaissance (1469-1523)*. trans. W. W. Phelps. Athens.
- Manuzio, Aldo. 1503 [1521²]. *Florilegium diversorum epigrammatum in septem libros*.
- Manwell, E. 2005. "Dico Ergo Sum: Erinna's Voice and Poetic Reality." Pp. 72-90 in E. Greene, ed. *Women Poets in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Norman, Oklahoma.
- Marcovich, M. 1971. "Der Gott Lychnos." *RhM* 114: 333-9.
- Mariotti, S. 1967. "Da Platone agli Epigrammi Bobbiesi." *StudUrb* 41: 1071-96.
- Markwald, G. 1986. *Die homerischen Epigramme*. Königstein.
- Martina, A., ed. 2003. *Teatro greco postclassico e teatro latino: Teorie e prassi drammatica (Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Roma 16-18 ottobre 2001)*. Rome.
- Marullo, M. 1951. *Carmina*. ed. A. Perosa. Zurich.
- Massaro, M. 1992. *Epigrafia metrica latina di età repubblicana*. Bari.
- . 1998. "Gli epigrammi per *L. Mecius Pilotimus* e *A. Granius Stabilio* (CIL, I², 1209 e 1210)." *Epigraphica* 60: 183-206.
- . 2002. "Il 'ciclo degli Scipioni' e le origini della epigrafia metrica latina." Pp. 17-37 in J. Del Hoyo, J. Gómez Pallarès, eds. *Asta ac pellege. 50 años de la publicación de Inscripciones Hispanas en verso de S. Mariner*. Madrid.
- Massimilla, G., ed. 1996. *Callimaco, Aitia: Libri primo e secondo*. Pisa.
- Matthaiou, A. P. 1986. "Two Archaic Attic Funerary Stelai." *Horos* 4: 31-4.
- . 1988. "Νέος λίθος τοῦ μνημείου μὲ τὰ ἐπιγράμματα γιὰ τοὺς Περσικοὺς πολέμους." *Horos* 6: 118-22.
- . 2000-3. "Εἰς Αἰγ I 4256." *Horos* 14-16: 143-52.
- Matthews, V. J. 1996. *Antimachus of Colophon. Text and Commentary*. Leiden.
- Maurer, K. 1977. "Formen des Lesens." *Poetica* 9: 472-98.
- McClure, L. 2001. "Introduction." Pp. 3-16 in A. Lardinois and L. McClure, eds. *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society*. Princeton.
- McEuen, K. A. 1968 [1939]. *Classical Influence upon the Tribe of Ben: A Study of Classical Elements in the Non-dramatic Poetry of Ben Jonson and his Circle*. New York [Cedar Rapids, Iowa].
- McFarlane, I. D. 1981. *Buchanan*. London.
- McLean, B. H. 2002. *An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods from Alexander the Great down to the Reign of Constantine (323 B.C.-A.D. 337)*. Ann Arbor.
- Medici, L. de'. 1992. *Opere*. ed. T. Zanato. Turin.
- Meerwaldt, J. D. 1954. "Epithalamica. De Himerio Sapphus imitatore." *Mnemosyne* 7: 19-39.
- Meiggs, R. 1972. *The Athenian Empire*. Oxford.
- Meijering, R. 1987. *Literary and Rhetorical Theories in Greek Scholia*. Diss. Groningen.
- Meliadò, C. 2005. "Posidippo, l'epos ellenistico e la propaganda tolemaica." Pp. 203-16

- in M. Di Marco, B. M. Palumbo Stracca and E. Lelli, eds. 2005. *Posidippo e gli altri: Il poeta, il genere, il contesto culturale e letterario. Atti dell'incontro di studio, Roma, 14–15 maggio 2004. Appunti Romani di Filologia 6, 2004*. Pisa.
- Merkelbach, R., and Stauber, J. 1998–2004. *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten*. 5 vols. Stuttgart.
- Merrit, B. 1940. *Epigraphica Attica*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Mesk, J. 1927. "Sappho und Theocrit in der Ich Rede des Himerios." *WS* 44: 160–70.
- Meyer, C. 1970. *Die Urkunden im Geschichtswerk des Thukydides*. 2nd ed. Munich.
- Meyer, D. 1993. "Die Einbeziehung des Lesers in den Epigrammen des Kallimachos." Pp. 161–75 in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit and G. C. Wakker, eds. *Callimachus*. Groningen.
- . 2005. *Inszeniertes Lesevergnügen. Das inschriftliche Epigramm und seine Rezeption bei Kallimachos*. Stuttgart.
- Miall, D. S. 2003. "Literary Discourse." Pp. 321–55 in A. C. Graesser, M. A. Gernsbacher, and S. R. Goldman, eds. *Handbook of Discourse Processes*. Mahwah, New Jersey.
- Miedema, H. 1968. "The Term 'Emblema' in Alciati." *JWI* 31: 234–50.
- Mineur, W. H., ed. 1984. *Callimachus. Hymn to Delos*. Leiden.
- Minturno, A. S. 1970. *De poeta (1559)*. Munich.
- . 1971. *L'arte poetica (1564)*. Munich.
- Miralles, C., and Pörtulas, J. 1983. *Archilochus and the Iambic Poetry*. Rome.
- Mitchell, W., and Thomas, J. 1986. *Iconology: Image, Text, Ideology*. Chicago.
- Moll, O. 1920. *Dioskorides (Vorbilder, Nachahmungen, Metrik)*. Zurich.
- Molyneux, J. H. 1992. *Simonides: A Historical Study*. Wauconda.
- Montaigne, M. de. 1962. *Œuvres complètes*. ed. A. Thibaudet and M. Rat. Paris.
- Montanari F., ed. 1994. *La philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine*. Vandoeuvres-Geneva.
- . 2002. "Callimaco e la filologia." Pp. 59–92 in L. Lehnus and F. Montanari, eds. *Callimaque*. Vandoeuvres-Geneva.
- . 2004. *GI. Vocabolario della lingua greca*. Turin.
- Montesquieu, C. de Secondat, baron de. 1899–1901. *Pensées et fragments inédits*. 2 vols. Bordeaux.
- More, T. 1963–97. *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More*. 15 vols. New Haven.
- Morel, see *FPL*.
- Morelli, A. M. 2000. *L'epigramma latino prima di Catullo*. Cassino.
- . 2005. "Il Liber Catulli di Terenziano Mauro." *S&T* 3: 71–91.
- Moreno, P. 1990. "Kairos." *LIMC* 5.1: 920–6.
- Moretti, L. 1953. *Iscrizioni agonistiche greche*. Rome.
- Moriatou, D. 1994. *Die Äusserungen des Aristoteles über die Dichter und Dichtung ausserhalb der Poetik*. Stuttgart.
- Moser von Filseck, K. 1988. *Der Apoxyomenos des Lysipp und das Phänomen von Zeit und Raum in der Plastik des 5. und 4. Jhs. v. Chr.* Bonn.
- Mouraviev, S. 2003. *Heracleïta, III.1: Recensio: Memoria*. Sankt Augustin.
- Mukarovskij, J. 1970. *Aesthetic Function, Norm and Value as Social Facts*. Ann Arbor.
- Mulhauser, R. E. 1969. *Sainte-Beuve and Greco-Roman Antiquity*. Cleveland.
- Müller, F. L. 1997. *Das Problem der Urkunden bei Thukydides*. Stuttgart.
- Müller, K. 1935. *Die Epigramme des Antiphilos von Bysanz: Einleitende Untersuchungen, Text und Kommentar*. Berlin.
- Murgia, C. E. 2002. "Critica varia." Pp. 67–75 in J. F. Miller, C. Damon, and K. S. Myers, eds. *Vertis in usum: Studies in honor of Edward Courtney*. Munich.
- Murnaghan, S. 1999. "The Poetics of Loss in Greek Epic." Pp. 203–20 in M. Beissinger, J. Tylus, and S. Wofford, eds. *Epic Traditions in the Contemporary World: The Poetics of Community*. Berkeley.

- Murphy, R. J. 2004. "The Act of Viewing: Iser, Bordwell and the 'Post-Theory' Debates in Contemporary Film Studies." Pp. 119–45 in E. Shaffer and A. Brady, eds. *Wolfgang Iser: The Act of Reading and After. Comparative Critical Studies* 1.1–2.
- Murray, O. 1983a. "The Greek Symposium in History." Pp. 257–72 in E. Gabba, ed. *Tria corda: scritti in onore di Arnaldo Momigliano*. Como.
- . 1983b. "The Symposium as Social Organization." Pp. 195–9 in R. Hägg, ed. *The Greek Renaissance of the Eighth Century B.C.: Tradition and Innovation*. Stockholm.
- , ed. 1990. *Symptica. A Symposium on the Symposion*. Oxford.
- . 1996. "Hellenistic Royal Symposia." Pp. 15–27 in P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad and J. Zahn, eds. *Aspects of Hellenistic Kingship*. Aarhus.
- Nagy, G. 1979. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Baltimore.
- . 2004. "Homeric Echoes in Posidippus." Pp. 57–64 in B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou and M. Baumbach, eds. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309)*. Washington.
- Nappa, C. J. 2001. *Aspects of Catullus' Social Fiction*. Frankfurt a. M.
- Nauta, R. R. 2002. *Poetry for Patrons: Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian*. Leiden.
- Navagero, A. 1973. *Lusus*. ed. A. E. Wilson. Nieuwkoop.
- Neaves, (Lord) C. 1893. *The Greek Anthology*. Edinburgh.
- Neer, R. T. 1995. "The Rhetoric of the Kouros: Body, Metaphor, Ideology." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Philological Association, San Diego, 28 December.
- . 2001. "Framing the Gift: The Politics of the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi." *ClAnt* 20: 273–336.
- . 2004. "The Athenian Treasury at Delphi and the Material of Politics." *ClAnt* 23: 63–93.
- Neppi Modona, A. 1933. *L'isola di Coe nell'antichità classica*. Rodi.
- Neri, C. 1996. *Studi sulle testimonianze di Erinna*. Bologna.
- . 1997. "Erinna a Ossirinco." *ŽPE* 115: 57–72.
- . 2003. *Erinna, Testimonianze e frammenti*. Bologna.
- Neumer-Pfau, W. 1982. *Studien zur Ikonographie und gesellschaftlichen Funktion hellenistischer Aphrodite-Statuen*. Bonn.
- Newman, J. K. 1990. *Roman Catullus and the Modification of the Alexandrian Sensibility*. Hildesheim.
- Nicosia, S. 1976. *Tradizione testuale diretta and indiretta dei poeti di Lesbo*. Rome.
- Nisbet, G. 2003a. *Greek Epigram in the Roman Empire. Martial's forgotten rivals*. Oxford.
- . 2003b. "A sickness of Discourse: The Vanishing Syndrome of ΑΕΙΤΟΣΥΝΗ." *G&R* 50: 191–205.
- . 2006. "'That's Not Funny': Advice in Skoptic Epigram." In D. Spencer and E. Theodorakopoulos, eds. *Advice and Advisors in Antiquity*. Bari.
- Nisetich, F. J. 1975. "Olympian 1.8–11: An Epinician Metaphor." *HSPH* 79: 55–68.
- . 2001. *The Poems of Callimachus*. Oxford.
- . 2005. "The Poems of Posidippus." Pp. 17–64 in K. Gutzwiller, ed. *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*. Oxford.
- Nosarti, L. 1999. *Filologia in frammenti. Contributi esegetici e testuali ai frammenti dei poeti latini*. Bologna.
- Nünning, A. 2004. *Grundbegriffe der Literaturtheorie*. Stuttgart.
- O'Higgins, D. M. 2001. "Women's Cultic Joking and Mockery: Some Perspectives." Pp. 137–60 in A. Lardinois and L. McClure, eds. *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society*. Princeton.
- Obbink, D., ed. 1995. *Philodemus and Poetry: Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus and Horace*. Oxford.
- . 2004a. "Posidippus on Papyri Then and Now." Pp. 16–28 in B. Acosta-Hughes,

- E. Kosmetatou and M. Baumbach, eds. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus* (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309). Washington.
- . 2004b. “‘*Tropoi*’ (Posidippus AB 102–103).” Pp. 292–301 in B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou and M. Baumbach, eds. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus* (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309). Washington.
- . 2005. “New Old Posidippus and Old New Posidippus: From Occasion to Edition in the Epigrams.” Pp. 97–115 in K. J. Gutzwiller, ed. *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*. Oxford.
- Ogilvie, R. M. 1962. “The Song of Thyrsis.” *JHS* 82: 106–10.
- Oltramare, A. 1926. *Les origines de la diatribe romaine*. Geneva.
- Opitz, M. 1966. *Buch von der Deutschen Poeterey* (1624). Tübingen.
- . 1975. *Weltliche Poemata 1644*. 2 vols. Tübingen.
- Osborne, R. 1985. “The Erection and Mutilation of the Hermai.” *PCPhS* 211: 47–73.
- . 1999. “Inscribing Performance.” Pp. 341–58 in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne, eds. *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*. Cambridge.
- . 2001. “The use of abuse: Semonides 7.” *PCPhS* 47: 47–64.
- . 2002. “Archaic Greek History.” Pp. 497–520 in E. J. Bakker, I. J. F. De Jong, and H. Van Wees, eds. *Brill’s Companion to Herodotus*. Leiden.
- Ouvré, H. 1894a. *Mélèagre de Gadara*. Paris.
- . 1894b. *Quae fuerint dicendi genus ratioque metrica apud Asclepiaden, Posidippum, Hedylum*. Paris.
- Owen, G. E. L. 1983. “Philosophical Invective.” *OSAPh* 1: 1–25.
- Paduano, G. 1989. *Antologia Palatina: epigrammi erotici, libro 5 e libro 12. Introduzione, traduzione e note*. Milan.
- Page, D. L. 1941. *Select Papyri*. Vol. 3: *Literary Papyri: Poetry*. Cambridge, Mass.
- . 1955. *Sappho and Alcaeus: An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry*. Oxford.
- . 1963. “Some metrical rules in Meleager.” Pp. 544–7 in *Miscellanea di studi alexandrini in memoria di Augusto Rostagni*. Turin.
- , ed. 1975. *Epigrammata Graeca*. Oxford.
- . 1976. “Five Hellenistic epitaphs in mixed metres.” *WS* 10: 165–76.
- , ed. 1978. *The Epigrams of Rufinus*. Cambridge.
- . 1981. *Further Greek Epigrams*. Cambridge.
- Pagonari-Antoniou, Ph. 1997. *Καλλιμάχου Επιγράμματα*. Athens.
- Palumbo Stracca, B. M. 1987. “Differenze dialettali e stilistiche nella storia dell’epigramma greco.” Pp. 429–34 in G. Bolognesi and V. Pisani, eds. *Linguistica e filologia. Atti del VII convegno internazionale di linguisti*. Brescia.
- . 1993–4. “Note dialettologiche al nuovo Posidippo.” *Helikon* 33–34: 405–12.
- . 2003. “Iperdorismi in Posidippo?” *QUCC* N.S. 75: 139–43.
- Pannonius, J. 1951. *Pjesme i epigrama*. ed. and trans. N. Šop. Zagreb.
- Papalexandrou, N. 2004. “Reading as Seeing: P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309 and Greek Art.” Pp. 247–58 in B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou, and M. Baumbach, eds. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus* (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309). Washington.
- . 2005. *The Visual Poetics of Power: Warriors, Youths, and Tripods in Early Greece*. Lanham.
- Pardini, A. 1991a. “Aconzio Non Era Polukrotos.” *SIFC* 84: 57–70.
- . 1991b. “La ripartizione in libri dell’opera di Alceo: per un riesame della questione.” *RFIC* 119: 257–84.
- Parker, H. N. 2004. “An Epigram of Nossis (8 GP = AP 6.353).” *CQ* 54: 618–20.
- Parsons, P. J. 1993. “Identities in Diversity.” Pp. 152–70 in A. W. Bulloch, E. S. Gruen, A. A. Long, and A. Stewart, eds. *Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World*. Berkeley.

- . 2002. "Callimachus and the Hellenistic Epigram." Pp. 99–141 in L. Lehnus and F. Montanari, eds. *Callimachee*. Vandoeuvres-Geneva.
- Pascucci, G. 1979. "Praeneoterica. Lutazio, Callimaco e Plauto." Pp. 1.109–26 in *Scritti di poesia latina in onore di Antonio Traglia*. 3 vols. Rome.
- Pasoli, E. 1980. "Appunti sul ruolo del c. 68 di Catullo nell'origine dell'elegia latina." Pp. 17–26 in A. Thill, ed. *L'épigramme latine. Enracinement, thèmes, diffusion*. Paris.
- Passow, F. 1835. "De vestigiis Coronarum Meleagri et Philippi in Anthologia Constantini Cephalae." Pp. 176–97 in N. Bachius, ed. *Opuscula academica*. Leipzig.
- Pater, W. 1980. *The Renaissance: Studies in Art and Poetry: The 1893 Text*. ed. D. L. Hill. Berkeley.
- Paton, W. R. 1916–9. *The Greek Anthology*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Peek, W. 1955. *Griechische Versinschriften*, 1: *Grabepigramme*. Berlin.
- . 1960. *Griechische Grabgedichte, griechisch und deutsch*. Berlin.
- Peiper, R., ed. 1976 [1886]. *Decimi Magni Ausonii Burdigalensis opuscula*. Stuttgart [Leipzig].
- Pelc, J. 1980. *Jan Kochanowski*. Warsaw.
- Pelling, C. B. R., ed. 1990. *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*. Oxford.
- Perlman, P. J. 2004. "Writing on the Walls: The Architectural Context of Archaic Cretan Laws." Pp. 181–97 in L. P. Day, M. S. Mook, and J. D. Muhly, eds. *Crete Beyond the Palaces: Proceedings of the Crete 2000 Conference*. Philadelphia.
- Perrotet, T. 2002. *Route 66 A.D. On the Trail of Ancient Roman Tourists*. London.
- Perutelli, A. 1988. "Note a Calvo." Pp. 3.87–99 in V. Tandoi, ed. *Disiecti membra poetae*. 3 vols. Foggia.
- . 1990. "Lutazio Catulo poeta." *RFIC* 118: 257–81.
- Petrain, D. 2003. "Homer, Theocritus and the Milan Posidippus (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)." *CJ* 98: 359–88.
- Petrovic, A. 2003. "Akoè e autopsia. Zu den Quellen Herodots für die Thermopylai-Epigramme (Hdt. 7,228)." Pp. 255–73 in A. Hornung, C. Jäkel, and W. Schubert, eds. *Studia humanitatis ac litterarum trifolio Heidelbergensi dedicata. Festschrift für E. Christmann, W. Edelmeier, R. Kettemann*. Frankfurt.
- . 2005. "'Kunstvolle Stimme der Steine, sprich!'" Zur Intermedialität der griechischen epideiktischen Epigramme." *A&A* 51: 30–42.
- . 2007. *Kommentar zu den simonideischen Versinschriften*. Leiden.
- Petrovic, I., and Petrovic, A. 2003. "Stop and Smell the Statues: Callimachus' Epigram 51 Pf. Reconsidered (Four Times)." *MD* 51: 179–208.
- Pfeiffer, R. 1949–53 [repr. 1988]. *Callimachus*. 2 vols. [2 vols. in 1]. Oxford [Salem, NH].
- . 1955. "The Future of Studies in the Field of Hellenistic Poetry." *JHS* 75: 69–73.
- . 1968. *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford.
- . 1978. *Geschichte der Klassischen Philologie: Von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des Hellenismus*. Munich.
- Pfister, F. 1938. "Kairos und Symmetrie." Pp. 136–9 in R. Herbig, ed. *Würzburger Festgabe Heinrich Bulle dargebracht*. Stuttgart.
- Pfohl, G., ed. 1969. *Das Epigramm*. Darmstadt.
- Phillips, M. M. 1984. "The Paedagogion of Nicolas Bourbon." Pp. 71–82 in G. Castor and T. Cave, ed. *Neo-Latin and the Vernacular in Renaissance France*. Oxford.
- Picard, C. 1948. "Art et littérature: sur trois exégèses." *REG* 61: 337–57.
- . 1952. "Le Pindare de l'exèdre" *MMAI* 46: 5–24.
- Pickard-Cambridge, A. 1962. *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*. 2nd ed. ed. T. B. L. Webster. Oxford.
- . 1968. *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*. 2nd ed. Oxford.

- Pigna, G. B. 1997. *I romanzi*. Bologna.
- Pircher, J. 1979. *Das Lob der Frau im vorchristlichen Grabepigramm der Griechen*. with G. Pfohl. Innsbruck.
- Pirenne-Delforge, V. 1994. *L'Aphrodite grecque: Contribution à l'étude de ses cultes et de sa personnage dans le panthéon archaïque et classique*. Athens.
- Platthy, J. 1968. *Sources on the Earliest Greek Libraries*. Amsterdam.
- Pohlenz, M. 1926. "Das Satyrspiel und Pratinas von Phleius." *NGG* 3: 298–321.
- Poliziano, A. 1996. *Silvae*. ed. F. Bausi. Florence.
- . 2002. *Liber epigrammatum graecorum*. ed. F. Pontani. Rome.
- Pomeroy, S. B. 1978. "Supplementary Notes on Erinna." *ZPE* 32: 17–22.
- . 1984. *Women in Hellenistic Egypt: From Alexander to Cleopatra*. New York.
- Pontani, A. 1992. "Le maiuscole greche anticharie de Giano Lascaris: Per la storia dell'alfabeto greco in Italia nel '400." *S&C* 16: 78–227.
- . 2002. "Per l'esegi umanistica greca dell'Antologia Planudea: I marginali dell'edizione del 1494." Pp. 2.557–613 in V. Fera, G. Ferraú, and S. Rizzo, eds. *Talking to the Text: Marginalia from Papyri to Print*. 2 vols. Messina.
- Poole-Wilson, P. N. 1989. "A Best-seller Abroad: The Continental Editions of John Owen." Pp. 242–9 in T. Croiset van Uchelen, K. van der Horst, and G. Schilder. *Theatrum Orbis Librorum: Liber Amicorum Presented to Nico Israel*. Utrecht.
- Pordomingo, F. 1994. "Sur les premières anthologies d'épigrammes sur papyrus." Pp. 326–31 in *Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrologists*. Copenhagen.
- Port, W. 1925–6. "Die Anordnung in Gedichtbüchern augusteischer Zeit." *Philologus* 81: 280–308, 427–68.
- Porter, D. 1987. *Horace's Poetic Journey: A Reading of Odes 1–3*. Princeton.
- Porter, J. 1995. "Content and Form in Philodemus: The History of an Evasion." Pp. 97–147 in D. Obbink, ed. *Philodemus and Poetry: Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus, and Horace*. Oxford.
- Powell, B. B. 1991. *Homer and the Origin of the Greek Alphabet*. Cambridge.
- Praz, M. 1958. *The Flaming Heart*. Garden City.
- . 1964–74. *Studies in Seventeenth-Century Imagery*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Rome.
- Preger, T. 1891. *Inscriptiones Graecae metricae, ex scriptoribus praeter Anthologiam collectae*. Leipzig.
- Preisendanz, C. 1911. *Anthologia Palatina: codex Palatinus et codex Parisinus phototypice editi*. 2 vols. Leiden.
- Preisshofen, F. 1978. "Kunsttheorie und Kunstbetrachtung." Pp. 263–77 in H. Flashar, ed. *Le classicisme à Rome*. Vandoeuvres-Geneva.
- Pretagostini, R. 1977. "Teocrito e Saffo: forme allusive e contenuti nuovi." *QUCC* 24: 107–18.
- . 1990. "Le metafore di Eros che gioca: da Anacreonte ad Apollonio Rodio e ai poeti dell' *Antologia Palatina*." *AION(filol)* 12: 225–38.
- . 2000. "Vino, amore e...violenza sessuale: Hedyl. A.P. 5.199." Pp. 2.571–4 in M. Cannatà Fera & S. Grandolini, eds. *Poesia e religione in Grecia. Studi in onore di G. Aurelio Privitera*. 2 vols. Perugia.
- . 2002. "L'epigramma per Nicomache (Posidippo, P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309 IX 1–6). Pp. 121–7 in G. Bastianini and A. Casanova, eds. *Il papiro di Posidippo un anno dopo*. Florence.
- Pretagostini, R. and Dettori, E., eds. forthcoming 2007. *La cultura ellenistica: persistenza, innovazione, trasmissione (Atti del Convegno COFIN 2003. Università di Roma, Tor Vergata, 19–21 Sett. 2005)*. Rome.
- Prete, S. 1978. *Studies in Latin Poets of the Quattrocento*. Lawrence, Kansas.
- . 1981. "L'epigramma nel Quattrocento—Osservazioni." Pp. 3.215–26 in G. Tarugi, ed. *Ecumenismo della cultura*. 3 vols. Florence.
- Prioux, E. 2002. "Quatre Épigrammes de l'Anthologie dans une collection épigraphique de Venise." *RPh* 76: 108–11.
- Pritchett, W. K. 1975. *Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Thucydides*. Berkeley.

- . 1985. *The Greek State at War*. vol. 4. Berkeley.
- . 1993. *The Liar School of Herodotus*. Amsterdam.
- Proctor, R. 1900. *The Printing of Greek in the 15th Century*. Oxford.
- Pucci, J. 1998. *The Full-Knowing Reader: Allusion and the Power of the Reader in the Western Literary Tradition*. New Haven.
- Pucci, P. 1997. *Odysseus Polytropos: Intertextual Readings in the Odyssey and Iliad*. Ithaca.
- Puelma, M. 1996. “Επίγραμμα—epigramma: Aspekte einer Wortgeschichte.” *MH* 53: 123–39.
- . 1997. “Epigramma: Osservazioni sulla storia di un termine greco-latino.” *Maia* 49: 189–213.
- Puglisi, G. 1985. “Πλάσμα: num ψεύδος an ἀπάτη?” *Philologus* 129: 39–53.
- Quasimodo, S. 1958. *Fiore dell'Antologia Palatina*. Bologna.
- . 1969. *Leonida di Tarento*. Manduria.
- Quinn, K. 1999. *The Catullan Revolution*. 3rd ed. London.
- Rabe, H., ed. 1913. *Hermogenis opera*. Leipzig.
- Rackham, H. 1953. *Aristotle. The Athenian Constitution. The Eudemean Ethics. On Virtue and Vices*. 3rd ed. Cambridge, Mass.
- Radermacher, L. 1919. “Κανών.” *RE* 10: cc. 1873–8.
- Radice, G. L. 1965. “Leonida Tarentino, poeta ‘ricco’.” *Maia* 17: 141–57.
- Radinger, C. 1895. *Meleagros von Gadara: Eine literargeschichtliche Skizze*. Innsbruck.
- Raimondi, V. 1999. *Scelte linguistiche e τόποι letterari nell'epigramma bucolico greco*. Diss. Urbino.
- . 2005. “Αἰπολικός δύσερος in Posidippo 19 A.–B.: un richiamo al Ciclope innamorato infelice di Theocr. *Idd.* 6 e 11.” Pp. 133–46 in M. Di Marco, B. M. Palumbo Stracca and E. Lelli, eds. 2005. *Posidippo e gli altri: Il poeta, il genere, il contesto culturale e letterario. Atti dell'incontro di studio, Roma, 14–15 maggio 2004. Appunti Romani di Filologia* 6, 2004. Pisa.
- Rampichini, F. 2004. “Echi di Omero in quattro ‘oionoskopika’ di Posidippo (Epigrammi 21, 22, 23, 24).” *Acme* 57: 273–86.
- Rankin, H. D. 1977. *Archilochos of Paros*. Park Ridge, N.J.
- Rasche, W. 1910. *De Anthologiae Graecae epigrammatis quae colloquii formam habent*. Diss. Münster.
- Raubitschek, A. E. 1949. *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis*. Cambridge, Mass.
- . 1961. “Herodotus and the Inscriptions.” *BICS* 8: 59–61.
- . 1968. “Das Denkmal-Epigramm.” Pp. 1–36 in A. Dihle, ed. *L'Épigramme Grecque*. Vandoeuvres-Geneva.
- Rauk, J. 1989. “Erinna's *Distaff* and Sappho Fr.94.” *GRBS* 30: 101–16.
- Rayor, D. J. 2005. “The Power of Memory in Erinna and Sappho.” Pp. 59–71 in E. Greene, ed. *Women Poets in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Norman, Oklahoma.
- Reed, J. D. 2000. “Arsinoe's Adonis and the Poetics of Ptolemaic Imperialism.” *TAPhA* 130: 319–51.
- Reeder, R. 1976. “The Greek Anthology and Its Influence on Pushkin's Poetic Style.” *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 10: 205–27.
- Regenbogen, O. 1950. “ΠΙΝΑΞ.” *RE* 20b: 1408–82.
- Reiff, A. 1959. *Interpretatio, imitatio, aemulatio: Begriff und Vorstellung literarischer Abhängigkeit bei den Römern*. Diss. Cologne.
- Reitzenstein, R. 1893 [repr. 1970]. *Epigramm und Skolion: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der alexandrinischen Dichtung*. Giessen [Hildesheim].
- . 1907. “Epigramm.” *RE Hb* 11: col. 71–111.
- Renberg, G. forthcoming. “Dream-Narratives and Unnarrated Dreams in Greek and Latin Dedicatory Inscriptions.” In C. Walde and E. Scioli, eds. *Sub Imagine Somni: Dreams and Other Nocturnal Phenomena in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. Pisa.
- Rengakos, A. 1992. “Homerische Wörter bei Kallimachos.” *ΖΡΕ* 94: 21–47.
- . 1993. *Der Homertext und die hellenistischen Dichter*. Stuttgart.
- . 1994. *Apollonios Rhodios und die antike Homererklärung*. Munich.

- . 2001. "Apollonius Rhodius as a Homeric Scholar." Pp. 193–216 in T. D. Papangelis and A. Rengakos, eds. *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius*. Leiden.
- Renouard, A. A. 1953. *Annali delle edizioni aldine*. Bologna.
- Rexroth, K. 1962. *Poems from the Greek Anthology*. Ann Arbor.
- Reynolds, L. D., and Wilson, N. G. 1968. *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*. London.
- Richardson, N. J. 1994. "Aristotle and Hellenistic Scholarship." Pp. 39–83 in F. Montanari, ed. *La philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine*. Vandoeuvres-Geneva.
- Ridglin, A. 1981. "The Meaning of *irrumare* in Catullus and Martial." *CPh* 76: 40–6.
- . 2002. *The Garden of Priapus. Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*. 2nd ed. New York.
- Richter, G. M. A. 1965. *The Portraits of the Greeks*. London.
- Ridgway, B. S. 1990. *Hellenistic Sculpture I: The Styles of ca. 331–200 B.C.* Madison.
- Riginos, A. 1976. *Platonica. The Anecdotes Concerning the Life and Writings of Plato*. Leiden.
- Ritoók, Zs. 1972. "Verse Translations from Greek by Janus Pannonius." *AantHung* 20: 235–70.
- Robb, K. 1994. *Literacy and Paideia in Ancient Greece*. New York.
- Robert, L. 1968. "Les épigrammes satiriques de Lucillius sur les athlètes: parodie et réalités." Pp. 179–295 in A. Dihle, ed. *L'Épigramme Grecque*. Vandoeuvres-Geneva.
- Robert, R. 1992. "Ars regenda amore. Séduction érotique et plaisir esthétique: De Praxitèle à Ovide." *MEFRA* 104: 373–438.
- Roberts, C. H. 1953. "Literature and Society in the Papyri." *MH* 10: 264–79.
- Robortello, F. 1548 [repr. 1968]. *In librum Aristotelis de arte poetica explicationes*. [Munich].
- Rogers, S. 1974. *Classical Greece and the Poetry of Chénier, Shelley, and Leopardi*. Notre Dame.
- Rollins, H. E., ed. 1965. *Tottel's Miscellany (1557–1587)*. rev. ed. Cambridge, Mass.
- Roman, L. 2001. "The Representation of Literary Materiality in Martial's *Epigrams*." *JRS* 91: 113–45.
- Rose, J. H. 1931. "The Epigram on Pindar's Death." *CQ* 25: 121–2.
- Rosen, R. M. 1990. "Hipponax and the Homeric Odysseus" *Eikasmos* 1: 11–25.
- . forthcoming 2007. *Making Mockery: The Poetics of Ancient Satire*. Oxford.
- Rosenmeyer, P. A. 1991. "Her Master's Voice: Sappho's Dialogue with Homer." *MD* 39: 123–49.
- . 1992. *The Poetics of Imitation: Anacreon and the Anacreontic Tradition*. Cambridge.
- . 2002. "Epistolary Epigrams in the Greek Anthology." Pp. 137–49 in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker, eds. *Hellenistic Epigrams*. Leuven.
- Rösler, W. 1980. "Die Entdeckung der Fiktionalität in der Antike." *Poetica* 12: 283–319.
- . 1983. "Über Deixis und einige Aspekte mündlichen und schriftlichen Stils in antiker Lyrik." *WJA* 9: 7–28.
- Ross, D. O. 1969. *Style and Tradition in Catullus*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Rossi, L. 2001. *The Epigrams Ascribed to Theocritus: A Method of Approach*. Leuven.
- . 2002. "Composition and Reception in AP 9.1–583: Aphegeseis, Epideixeis and Progymnasmata." Pp. 151–74 in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker, eds. *Hellenistic Epigrams*. Leuven.
- Rothberg, I. P. 1954. *The Greek Anthology in Spanish Poetry: 1500–1700*. Diss. Pennsylvania State.
- . 1956. "Covarrubias, Gracián, and the Greek Anthology." *Studies in Philology* 53: 540–52.
- . 1975. "Lope de Vega and the Greek Anthology." *Romanische Forschungen* 87: 239–56.
- . 1981. "Fray Luis de León and the Greek Anthology." *Revista de Estudios Hispánicos* 15.2: 163–79.
- Roukhomovsky, B. 2001. *Lire les formes brèves*. Paris.

- Rubensohn, M. 1897. *Griechische Epigramme und andere kleinere Dichtungen in deutschen Übersetzung des XVI. und XVII. Jahrhunderts*. Weimar.
- . 1888. *Crinagorae Mytilenaei epigrammata*. Berlin.
- Rüdiger, H. 1933. *Sappho, ihr Ruf und Ruhm bei der Nachwelt*. Leipzig.
- Runia, D. T. 1986. "Theocritus of Chios' Epigram against Aristotle." *CQ* 36: 531–4.
- Russell, D. 1999. "The Genres of Epigram and Emblem." Pp. 278–83 in G. P. Norton, ed. *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, vol. 3: *The Renaissance*. Cambridge.
- Russell, D. A. 1990. "Éthos in Oratory and Rhetoric." Pp. 197–212 in C. B. R. Pelling, ed. *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*. Oxford.
- Russo, J., Fernandez-Galiano, M., and Heubeck, A. 1992. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey: Books XVII–XXIV*. Oxford.
- Ruthven, K. K. 1969a. *The Conceit*. London.
- . 1969b. *A Guide to Ezra Pound's Personae (1926)*. Berkeley.
- Saïd, S. 2001. "Un exemple de tragédie expérimentale: l'*Oreste* d'Euripide." Pp. 47–61 in A. Grilli and A. Simon, eds. *L'officina del teatro europeo*. 2 vols. Pisa.
- Sainte-Beuve, C.-A. 1864–70. *Nouveaux Lundis*. 13 vols. Paris.
- . 1908. *Portraits contemporains*. 5 vols. Paris.
- Sandys, J. E. 1958 [1903–8]. *A History of Classical Scholarship*. 3 vols. New York.
- Santirocco, M. S. 1986. *Unity and Design in Horace's Odes*. Chapel Hill.
- Sarkissian, J. 1983. *Catullus 68: An Interpretation*. Leiden.
- Sartre, J. P. 1985. *Qu'est-ce que la littérature?* Paris.
- Sattler, W. M. 1947. "Conceptions of *Ethos* in Ancient Rhetoric." *Speech Monographs* 14: 55–63.
- Saunders, A. 1982. "Alciati and the Greek Anthology." *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 12: 1–18.
- Scaliger, J. C. 1994–. *Poetices libri septem*. ed. L. Deitz and G. Vogt-Spira. Stuttgart.
- Scaliger, J. J. 1573. *Publii Virgilii Maronis appendix cum supplemento multorum ante hac nunquam excusorum poematum veterum poetarum*. Lyon.
- Scheer, T. S. 2000. *Die Gottheit und ihr Bild: Untersuchungen zur Funktion griechischer Kultbilder in Religion und Politik*. Munich.
- Schefold, K. 1943. *Die Bildnisse der antiken Dichter Redner und Denker*. Basel.
- . 1965. *Griechische Dichterbildnisse*. Zurich.
- Scheidweiler, F. 1956. "Erinns Klage um Baukis." *Philologus* 100: 40–51.
- Schenkl, H., Downey, G., and Norman, A.F., eds. 1965–74. *Themistii Orationes*. Leipzig.
- Scherf, J. 1996. *Untersuchungen zur antiken Veröffentlichung der Catull-Gedichte*. Hildesheim.
- . 1998. "Komposition von Martials Gedichtbüchern." Pp. 128–31 in F. Grewing, ed. *Toto Notus in Orbe*. Wiesbaden.
- Schievenin, R. 2000. "Poesia e turpiloquio nel carme 16 di Catullo." *MD* 44: 195–209.
- Schmidt, F. 1922. *Die Pinakes des Kallimachos*. Berlin.
- Schnur, H. C. 1973. "The Humanist Epigram and Its Influence on the German Epigram." Pp. 557–76 in J. IJsewijn and E. Keßler, eds. *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Lovaniensis*. Munich.
- Scholz, B. F. 1986. "'Libellum composui epigrammaton, cui titulum feci Emblemata': Alciatus's Use of the Expression Emblemata Once Again." *Emblematica* 1: 213–26.
- Scholz, U. W. 1973. "Erinna." *A&A* 18: 15–40.
- Schoofield, G. 1980. *Janus Secundus*. Boston.
- Schott, P. 1905. *Posidippi epigrammata collecta et illustrata*. Diss. Berlin.
- Schreiber, F. 1982. *The Eschienes*. New York.
- Schreiner, J. H. 1976. "Anti-Thukydidean Studies in the Pentekontaetia." *SO* 51: 19–63.
- Schröder, S. 2004. "Skeptische Überlegungen zum Mailänder Epigrammpapyrus (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)." *ZPE* 148: 29–73.
- Schulz-Buschhaus, U. 1969. *Das Madrigal: Zur Stilgeschichte der italienischen Lyrik zwischen Renaissance und Barock*. Bad Homburg.

- Schulz-Vanheyden, E. 1970. *Properz und das griechische Epigramm*. Diss. Münster.
- Schur, D. 2004. "A Garland of Stones: Hellenistic *Lithika* as Reflections on Homeric Transformations." Pp. 118–22 in B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou and M. Baumbach, eds. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus* (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309). Washington.
- Schwarz, G. 1971. *Die griechische Kunst des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. im Spiegel der Anthologia Graeca*. Vienna.
- Schwinge, E.-R. 1986. *Künstlichkeit von Kunst: Zur Geschichtlichkeit der alexandrinischen Poesie*. München.
- Scodel, R. 1980. "Hesiod Redivivus." *GRBS* 21: 301–20.
- . 1992. "Inscription, Absence and Memory." *SIFC* 10: 57–76.
- . 2003a. "Two Epigrammatic Pairs: Callimachus' Epitaphs, Plato's Apples." *Hermes* 131: 257–68.
- . 2003b. "A Note on Posidippus 63 AB (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309 X 16–25)." *ζPE* 142: 44.
- Scorza, G. 1934. "Il peripatetico Cameleonte." *RIGI* 18: 1–48.
- Sebillot, T. 1932. *Art poétique françoys*. ed. F. Gaiffe. Paris.
- Sedley, D. 1976. "Epicurus and His Professional Rivals." Pp. 119–60 in J. Bollack and A. Laks, eds. *Études sur l'épicurisme antique*. Lille.
- . 1977. "Diodorus Cronos and Hellenistic Philosophy." *PCPhS* 23: 74–120.
- , ed. 2003. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Philosophy*. Cambridge.
- Seelbach, W. 1964. *Die Epigramme des Menasalkes von Sikyon und des Theodoridas von Syrakus*. Wiesbaden.
- Segal, C. 1984. "Underreading and Intertextuality: Sappho, Simaetha and Odysseus in Theocritus II Idyll." *Arethusa* 16: 201–9.
- Seidensticker, B. 1976. "Zu Horaz, C. 1.1–9." *Gymnasium* 83: 26–34.
- Selden, D. L. 1998. "Alibis." *ClAnt* 17: 289–412.
- Semerano, G. 1951. "La lirica greca e latina del Poliziano: epigrammata." *Convivium* 20: 337–46.
- Sens, A. 2002a. "The Corpus Asclepiadeum and Early Epic." Pp. 201–14 in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, G. C. Wakker, eds. *Hellenistic Epigrams*. Leuven.
- . 2002b. "An Ecphrastic Pair: Asclepiades AP 12.75 and Asclepiades or Posidippus AP 168." *CJ* 97: 249–62.
- . 2003. "Asclepiades, Erinna, and the Poetics of Labor." Pp. 78–87 in P. Thibodeau and H. Haskell, eds. *Being There Together*. Afton, Minn.
- . 2004. "Doricisms in the New and Old Posidippus." Pp. 65–83 in B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou and M. Baumbach, eds. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus* (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309). Washington.
- . 2005a. "The Art of Poetry and the Poetry of Art: The Unity and Poetics of Posidippus' Statue-Poems." Pp. 206–25 in K. Gutzwiller, ed. *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*. Oxford.
- . 2005b. Review of Di Marco, M., Palumbo Stracca, B. M., and Lelli, E., eds. 2005. *Posidippo e gli altri: Il poeta, il genere, il contesto culturale e letterario. Atti dell'incontro di studio, Roma, 14–15 maggio 2004. Appunti Romani di Filologia* 6, 2004. Pisa. *BMCRev* 2005.10.08 (<http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/bmcr/2005/2005-10-08.html>).
- . forthcoming. *Hellenistic Epigram*. Cambridge.
- Setaioli, A. 1977. "Gli epitafi di due illustri romani." *RCCM* 19: 699–709.
- Setti, G. 1900. "Simonide di Ceo e l'autenticità de' suoi epigrammi." *RFIC* 29: 471–82.
- Shaffer, E. and Brady, A., eds. 2004. *Wolfgang Iser: The Act of Reading and After. Comparative Critical Studies* 1.1–2.
- Sharrock, A. and Morales, H., eds. 2000. *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman Textual Relations*. Oxford.
- Sheidley, W. E. 1972. "George Turberville's Epigrams from the Greek Anthology: A Case-Study of 'Englishing'." *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 12: 71–84.

- Sider, D. 1987. "The Love Poetry of Philodemus." *AJP* 108: 310–24.
- . 1995. "The Epicurean Philosopher as Hellenistic Poet." Pp. 42–57 in D. Obbink, ed. *Philodemus and Poetry: Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus, and Horace*. Oxford.
- . 1997. *The Epigrams of Philodemus: Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. Oxford.
- . 2001. "'As is the generation of leaves' in Homer, Simonides, Horace, and Stobaeus." Pp. 272–88 in D. Boedeker and D. Sider, eds. *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*. New York.
- . 2004. "Posidippus Old and New." Pp. 29–41 in B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou and M. Baumbach, eds. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (PMil.Vogl. VIII 309)*. Washington.
- . 2005. *The Fragments of Anaxagoras*. 2nd ed. Sankt Augustin.
- Silver, I. 1981–7. *Ronsard and the Hellenic Renaissance in France*. 3 vols. Geneva.
- Sistakou, E. 2002. "Kallimachos als Homererklärer: Das Beispiel der geographischen Namen." *WS* 115: 145–73.
- Sitzler, J. 1893. "Jahresbericht über die griechischen Lyriker." *Bursians Jahrbuch* 87: 115–280.
- . 1897. "Bericht über die griechischen Lyriker." *Bursians Jahrbuch* 92: 76–164.
- . 1900. "Jahresbericht über die griechischen Lyriker." *Bursians Jahrbuch* 104: 76–164.
- Skias, A. 1965. *Homer im griechischen Epigramm*. Athens.
- Skinner, M. B. 1982. "Briseis, the Trojan Women, and Erinna." *CW* 75: 265–9.
- . 1987. "Greek Women and the Metonymic: A Note on an Epigram by Nossis." *Ancient History Bulletin* 1: 39–42.
- . 1989. "Sapphic Nossis." *Arethusa* 22: 5–18.
- . 1991a. "Aphrodite Garlanded: Eros and Poetic Creativity in Sappho and Nossis." Pp. 76–96 in F. de Martino, ed. *Rose di Pieria*. Bari.
- . 1991b. "Nossis *Thelyglossos*: The Private Text and the Public Book." Pp. 20–47 in S. B. Pomeroy, ed. *Women's History and Ancient History*. Chapel Hill.
- . 2001. "Ladies' Day at the Art Institute: Theocritus, Herodas, and the Gendered Gaze." Pp. 201–22 in A. Lardinois and L. McClure, eds. *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society*. Princeton.
- . 2003. *Catullus in Verona: A Reading of the Elegiac Libellus*. Columbus.
- . 2005. "Nossis *Thelyglossos*." Pp. 112–38 in E. Greene, ed. *Women Poets in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Norman, Oklahoma.
- Skoie, M. 2002. *Reading Sulpicia. Commentaries 1475–1990*. Oxford.
- Skutsch, O. 1968. *Studia Enniana*. London.
- . 1969. "Symmetry and Sense in the Eclogues." *HSPH* 73: 153–69.
- . 1985. "On the Epigrams of Ennius." *LCM* 10: 146–8.
- Slater, N. 1998. "The Vase as Ventriloquist: Kalos-inscriptions and the Culture of Fame." Pp. 143–62 in E. A. Mackay, ed. *Signs of Orality: The Oral Tradition and its Influence in the Greek and Roman World*. Boston.
- Slater, W. J. 1982. "Aristophanes of Byzantium and Problem-Solving in the Museum." *CQ* 32: 336–49.
- Slings, S. R. 2000. "Symposium & Ideology: Two Hermeneutical Questions in Early Greek Lyric with Special Reference to Mimnermus." *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen* 63.1: 1–33.
- Smith, M. 2003. "Elusive Stones: Reading Posidippus' *Lithika* through Technical Writing on Stones." Pp. 105–17 in B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou and M. Baumbach, eds. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (PMil.Vogl. VIII 309)*. Washington.
- Smith, R. M. 1995. *Literary Quotations in the "Corpus Aristotelicum"*. Ann Arbor.
- Snyder, J. M. 1989. *The Woman and the Lyre: Women Writers in Classical Greece and Rome*. Carbondale, Ill.
- Sokolowski, F. 1955. *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure*. Paris.

- Solmsen, F. 1941. "The Aristotelian Tradition in Ancient Rhetoric." *AJPh* 62: 35–50, 169–90.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1995. *'Reading' Greek Death: To the End of the Classical Period*. Oxford.
- Spanoudakis, K. 2002. *Philotas of Cos*. Leiden.
- Speller, E. 2002. *Following Hadrian. A Second-Century Journey through the Roman Empire*. London.
- Speyer, W. 1975. "Myrons Kuh in der antiken Literatur und bei Goethe." *Arcadia* 10: 171–9.
- Spingarn, J. E., ed. 1908–9. *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century*. 3 vols. Oxford.
- Spitz, L. W. 1957. *Conrad Celtis: The German Arch-Humanist*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Sprigath, G. K. 2004. "Das Dictum des Simonides. Der Vergleich von Dichtung und Malerei." *Poetica* 36: 243–80.
- Stadtmüller, H. 1894–1906. *Anthologia Graeca epigrammatum Palatina cum Planudea*. 3 vols. Leipzig.
- Stark, R. 1957. "Sapphoremiszenzen." *Hermes* 85: 325–36.
- Stears, K. 1998. "Death Becomes Her: Gender and Athenian Death Ritual." Pp. 113–27 in S. Blundell and M. Williamson, eds. *The Sacred and Feminine in Ancient Greece*. New York.
- Stehle, E. 1997. *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece: Nondramatic Poetry in Its Setting*. Princeton.
- . 2001. "The Good Daughter: Mother's Tutelage in Erinna's *Distaff* and Fourth-Century Epitaphs." Pp. 179–200 in A. Lardinois and L. McClure, eds. *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society*. Princeton.
- Steiner, D. T. 1993. "Pindar's 'Oggetti Parlanti.'" *HSPH* 95: 159–80.
- . 1994. *The Tyrant's Writ: Myths and Images of Writing in Ancient Greece*. Princeton.
- . 2001. *Images in Mind: Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought*. Princeton.
- Stephen, G. M. 1959. "The Coronis." *Scriptorium* 13: 3–14.
- Stephens, S. A. 2003. *Seeing Double: Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Berkeley.
- . 2004a. "For you, Arsinoe..." Pp. 161–76 in B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou and M. Baumbach, eds. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves. Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)*. Washington.
- . 2004b. "Posidippus' Poetry Book: Where Macedon Meets Egypt." Pp. 63–86 in W. V. Harris and G. Ruffini, eds. *Ancient Alexandria Between Egypt and Greece*. Leiden.
- . 2005. "Battle of the Books." Pp. 229–48 in K. J. Gutzwiller, ed. *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*. Oxford.
- Stewart, A. F. 1997. *Art, Desire, and the Body in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.
- Stierle, K. H. 1975. "Was heißt Rezeption bei fiktionalen Texten?" *Poetica* 7: 345–87.
- Stoessl, F. 1957. "Catull als Epigrammatiker." *WS* 70: 290–305.
- Strootman, R. 2001. "Mecenaat aan de hellenistische hoven." *Lampas* 34: 190–206.
- . forthcoming 2007a. *The Hellenistic Royal Court: Court Culture, Ceremonial and Ideology in Greece, Egypt and the Near East, 336–60 BCE*. Diss. Utrecht.
- . forthcoming 2007b. "Literature and the Kings." In J. Clauss and M. Cuypers, eds. *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature*. Oxford.
- Stroud, R. S. 1994. "Thucydides and Corinth." *Chiron* 24: 267–304.
- Suerbaum, W. 1968. *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer Römischer Dichter: Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Ennius*. Hildesheim.
- . 2002. *Die archaische Literatur von den Anfängen bis Sullas Tod. Die vorliterarische Periode und die Zeit von 240 bis 78 v. Chr.* Vol. 1 in R. Herzog and P. L. Schmidt, eds. *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike*. Munich.
- Suleiman, S. R. and Crosman, I., eds. 1980. *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation*. Princeton.
- Sullivan, J. P. 1991. *Martial: the Unexpected Classic*. Cambridge.

- Sultan, N. 1993. "Private Speech, Public Pain: The Power of Women's Laments in Ancient Greek Poetry and Tragedy." Pp. 92–100 in K. Marshall, ed. *Rediscovering the Muses: Women's Musical Traditions*. Boston.
- Süss, W. 1910. *Ethos: Studien zur älteren griechischen Rhetorik*. Leipzig.
- Sutton, D. F. 1973. "Two Epigrams of Dioscorides (AP VII.37 and 707)." *RSC* 21: 173–6.
- Svenbro, J. 1988. *Phrasikleia. Anthropologie de la lecture en Grèce ancienne*. Paris.
- . 1993. *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece*. trans. J. Lloyd. Ithaca.
- . 2004. "Façons grecques de dire 'citer'." Pp. 265–79 in C. Darbo-Peschanski, ed. *La citation dans l'Antiquité. Actes du colloque du PARSÀ. Lyon, ENS LSH, 6–8 novembre 2002*. Grenoble.
- Symonds, J. A. 1873–6 [1880, 1893]. *Studies of the Greek Poets*. 2 vols. London.
- . 1893. *Studies of the Greek Poets*. 3rd ed. 2 vols. London.
- Syndikus, H. P., ed. 1984–90. *Catull. Eine Interpretation*. 3 vols. Darmstadt.
- Tandoi, V. 1981. "Gli epigrammi di Tiburtino a Pompei, Lutazio Catulo e il movimento dei preneoterici." *QuadFoggia* 1: 133–75.
- . 1982–3. "Gli epigrammi di Tiburtino dopo un autopsia del graffito." *QuadFoggia* 2–3: 3–31.
- Tannen, D. 1982. "Oral and Literate Strategies in Spoken and Written Narratives." *Language* 58: 1–21.
- . 1985. "Relative Focus on Involvement in Oral and Written Discourse." Pp. 124–47 in D. R. Olson, et al., eds. *Literacy, Language and Learning: The Nature and Consequences of Reading and Writing*. Cambridge.
- Tanner, J. 1999. "Culture, Social Structure and the Status of Visual Artists in Classical Greece." *PCPhS* 45: 136–75.
- Tarán, L. 1984. "Plato's Alleged Epitaph." *GRBS* 25: 63–82.
- Tarán, S. L. 1979. *The Art of Variation in the Hellenistic Epigram*. Leiden.
- . 1985. "'Εἰςὶ τρήχες'. An erotic motif in the Greek Anthology." *JHS* 105: 90–107.
- Tarditi, G. 1968. *Archiloco*. Rome.
- . 1989. "Le Muse e le Chariti tra fede del poeta ed ethos poietikon." *Aevum(ant)* 2: 19–45.
- Tarrant, D. 1951. "Plato's Use of Quotations." *CQ* 45: 59–67.
- Tasso, T. 1998. *Dialoghi*, ed. G. Baffetti. 2 vols. Milan.
- Themelis, P. G. 1994. "Artemis Ortheia in Messene: The Epigraphical and Archeological Evidence." Pp. 101–22 in R. Hägg, ed. *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence: Proceedings of the Second International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, Organized by the Swedish Institute at Athens, 22–24 November 1991*. Stockholm.
- Thomas, R. 1989. *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens*. Cambridge.
- . 1992. *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.
- . 1995. "Written in Stone? Liberty, Equality, Orality, and the Codification of Law." *BICS* 40: 59–74.
- Thomas, R. F. 1979. "New Comedy, Callimachus, and Roman Poetry." *HSPH* 83: 179–206.
- . 1998. "'Melodious Tears': Sepulchral Epigram and Generic Mobility." Pp. 205–23 in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit and G. C. Wakker, eds. *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*. Groningen.
- . 1999. "Virgil's Georgics and the Art of Reference." Pp. 114–41 in R. F. Thomas. *Reading Virgil and His Texts*. Ann Arbor.
- . 2004. "'Drowned in the Tide': The *Nauagika* and Some 'Problems' in Augustan Poetry." Pp. 259–75 in B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou and M. Baumbach, eds. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P.Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)*. Washington.
- Thompson, D. J. 1987. "Ptolemaios and the 'Lighthouse': Greek Culture in the Memphite Serapeum." *PCPhS* 213 n.s. 33: 105–21.

- . 2005. "Posidippus, Poet of the Ptolemies." Pp. 269–83 in K. J. Gutzwiller, ed. *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*. Oxford.
- Thomson, D. F. S. 1957. "The Latin Epigram in Scotland: The Sixteenth Century." *The Phoenix* 11: 63–78.
- , ed. 1997. *Catullus: Edited with a Textual and Interpretative Commentary*. Toronto.
- Tomlinson, G. 1987. *Monteverdi and the End of the Renaissance*. Berkeley.
- Tosi, R. 1997. "Callimaco e i Glossografi omerici." *Eikasmos* 8: 223–40.
- Trevelyan, H. 1981. *Goethe and the Greeks*. London.
- Trimpi, W. 1962. *Ben Jonson's Poems: A Study of the Plain Style*. Stanford.
- Turner, E. G. 1987. *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*. 2nd ed. ed. P. J. Parsons. London.
- Turyn, A. 1972–3. "Demetrius Triclinius and the Planudean Anthology." *EHBS* 39–40: 403–50.
- Usener, H. 1865. "Nochmals Valerius Aedituus." *RhM* 20: 147–51.
- . 1902. "Milch und Honig." *RhM* 55: 177–95.
- Usener, S. 1994. *Isokrates, Platon und ihr Publikum. Hörer und Leser von Literatur im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* Tübingen.
- Usher, S. 1974. *Dionysius of Halicarnassus: the Critical Essays*. Vol. 1. Cambridge, Mass.
- Vahlen, J., ed. 1903. *Ennianae poesis reliquiae*. 2nd ed. Leipzig.
- van Groningen, B. A. 1966. *Théognis. Le premier livre édité avec un commentaire*. Amsterdam.
- , ed. 1977. *Euphoriion*. Amsterdam.
- Van Sickle, J. B. 1978. *The Design of Virgil's Bucolics*. Rome.
- . 1981. "Poetics of Opening and Closure in Meleager, Catullus, and Gallus." *CW* 75: 65–75.
- . 1987. "The elogia of the Cornelli Scipiones and the Origin of Epigram at Rome." *AJP* 108: 41–55.
- . 1988. "The First Hellenistic Epigrams at Rome." Pp. 143–56 in N. Horsfall, ed. *Vir bonus discendi peritus: Papers in Honour of Otto Skutsch*. London.
- van Straten, F. T. 1976. "Daikrates' Dream: A Votive Relief from Kos, and Some Other kat'ónar Dedications." *BABesch* 51: 1–38.
- van Thiel, H., ed. 2000. *Scholia D in Iliadem*. Proecdosis in http://www.ub.uni-koeln.de/usb/fachinfos/pdf/vanThiel_scholiad.pdf.
- Vardi, A. D. 2000. "An anthology of early Latin epigrams? A ghost reconsidered." *CQ* 50: 147–58.
- Versnel, H. S. 1987. "What Did Ancient Man See When He Saw A God? Some Reflections on Greco-Roman Epiphany." Pp. 42–55 in D. van der Plas, ed. *Effigies Dei: Essays on the History of Religions*. Leiden.
- Vetta, M. 1982. "Il P.Oxy. 2506 fr. 77 e la poesia pederotica di Alceo." *QUCC* 39: 7–20.
- , ed. 1980. *Theognis Elegiarum liber secundus*. Rome.
- , ed. 1983. *Poesia e simposio nella Grecia antica: guida storica e critica*. Rome.
- Vischer, R. 1965. *Das einfache Leben: Wort- und motiwgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu einem Wertbegriff der antiken Literatur*. Göttingen.
- Voigt, E. M. 1971. *Sappho et Alcaeus: Fragmenta*. Amsterdam.
- Volkman, H. 1975. "Die Inschriften im Geschichtswerk des Herodot." Pp. 43–64 in H. Volkman. *Endoxos Duleia. Kleine Schriften zur Alten Geschichte*. Berlin.
- Voutiras, E. 1994. "Wortkarge Söldner? Ein Interpretationsvorschlag zum neuen Poseidippos." *ZPE* 104: 27–31.
- Vox, O. 1986. "Dafni lirico." *Belfagor* 41: 311–17.
- Wachter, R. 2001. *Non-Attic Greek Vase Inscriptions*. Oxford.
- Wade-Gery, H. 1933. "Classical Epigrams and Epitaphs." *JHS* 53: 71–104.
- Waern, I. 1960. "Greek Lullabies." *Eranos* 58: 1–8.
- Wagner, P. 1996. "Introduction: Ekphrasis, Iconotexts, and Intermediality the State(s) of Art(s)." Pp. 1–40 in P. Wagner, ed. *Icons Texts Iconotexts: Essays on Ekphrasis and Intermediality*. Berlin.

- Walbank, F. W. 1981. *The Hellenistic World*. rev. ed. Cambridge, Mass.
- Walker, J. 2000. *Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity*. Oxford.
- Wallace, M. B. 1984. "The Metres of Early Greek Epigrams." Pp. 303–17 in D. E. Gerber, ed. *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in Honour of Leonard Woodbury*. Chico.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A., ed. 1989. *Patronage in Ancient Society*. London.
- Walsh, G. B. 1990. "Surprised by Self: Audible Thought in Hellenistic Poetry." *CPh* 85: 1–21.
- . 1991. "Callimachean Passages: The Rhetoric of Epitaph in Epigram." *Arethusa* 24: 77–103.
- Waltz, P. 1906. *De Antipatro Sidonio*. Bourdeaux.
- Waltz, P., Aubreton, R., and Buffière, F., eds. 1957. *Anthologie grecque*. Tome VII (livre IX, Épigr. 1–358). Paris.
- Waltz, P., et al., eds. 1928–. *Anthologie grecque*. 13 tt. Paris.
- Warming, E. H., ed. 1935–40. *Remains of old Latin*. 4 vols. Cambridge, Mass.
- Webb, R. 1999. "Ekphrasis Ancient and Modern: The Invention of a Genre." *Word & Image* 15: 7–18.
- Weber, C. 1996. "Roscius and the *roscida dea*." *CQ* 46: 298–302.
- Weber, G. 1992. "Poesie und Poeten an den Höfen vorhellenistischer Monarchen." *Klio* 74: 25–77.
- . 1993. *Dichtung und höfische Gesellschaft: Die Rezeption von Zeitgeschichte am Hof der ersten drei Ptolemäer*. Stuttgart.
- . 1995. "Herrscher, Hof und Dichter: Aspekte der Legitimierung und Repräsentation hellenistischer Könige am Beispiel der ersten drei Antigoniden." *Historia* 44: 283–316.
- . 1997. "Interaktion, Repräsentation und Herrschaft: Der Königshof im Hellenismus." Pp. 27–71 in A. Winterling, ed. *Zwischen "Haus" und "Staat": Antike Höfe im Vergleich*. Munich.
- Weber, L. 1917. "Steinepigramm und Buchepigramm." *Hermes* 57: 536–57.
- Webster, T. B. L. 1963. "Alexandrian Epigrams and the Theatre." Pp. 531–43 in *Miscellanea di studi alessandrini in memoria di A. Rostagni*. Turin.
- . 1964. *Hellenistic Poetry and Art*. London.
- Weigand, G. 1845–7. "De fontibus et ordine Anthologiae Cephalanae." *RhM* 3: 161–178, 541–72 and 5: 276–88.
- Weil, H. 1879. *Un papyrus inédit de la bibliothèque de M. Ambroise Firmin-Didot*. Paris.
- Weinberg, B. 1961. *A History of Literary Criticism in the Italian Renaissance*. 2 vols. Chicago.
- Weinreich, O. 1918. "Die Heimat des Epigrammatikers Poseidippos." *Hermes* 53: 434–9.
- Weißhäupl, R. 1889. *Die Grabgedichte der griechischen Anthologie*. Vienna.
- Weisz, J. 1979. *Das deutsche Epigramm des 17. Jahrhunderts*. Stuttgart.
- West, M. L. 1974. *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*. Berlin.
- . 1977. "Erinna." *ZPE* 25: 95–119.
- . 1978. Review of Page, D. L., ed. 1975. *Epigrammata Graeca*. Oxford. In *Gnomon* 50: 1–4.
- . 1982. *Greek Metre*. Oxford.
- . 1989. *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Oxford.
- . 1992. *Ancient Greek Music*. Oxford.
- . 2001. "The Fragmentary Homeric Hymn to Dionysus." *ZPE* 134: 1–11.
- West, S. 1985. "Herodotus' Epigraphical Interest." *CQ* 35: 278–305.
- Westermann, A. 1845. *ΒΙΟΓΡΑΦΟΙ. Vitarum scriptores graeci minores*. Leipzig.
- Wheeler, A. L. 1934. *Catullus and the Traditions of Ancient Poetry*. Berkeley.
- Whigham, P. 1975. *The Poems of Meleager*. Berkeley.
- White, H. 1985. *New essays in Hellenistic Poetry*. Amsterdam.
- White, M. J. 1986. "What Worried the Crows?" *CQ* 36: 534–7.
- White, S. A. 1994. "Callimachus on Plato and Cleombrotus." *TAPhA* 124: 135–61.
- Whitmore, C. E. 1918. "Pastoral Elements in the Greek Epigram." *CJ* 13: 616–20.

- Wick, C. 2004. *M. Annaeus Lucanus. Bellum Civile Liber IX: Kommentar*. Munich.
- Wifstrand, A. 1926. *Studien zur griechischen Anthologie*. Lund.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von. 1897. *Callimachi hymni et epigrammata*. Berlin.
- . 1906. *Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Bukoliker*. Berlin.
- . 1913. *Sappho und Simonides. Untersuchungen über griechische Lyriker*. Berlin.
- . 1922. *Pindaros*. Berlin.
- . 1924. *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*. 2 vols. Berlin.
- Williams, G. D. 1982. "Phases in Political Patronage of Literature in Rome." Pp. 3–27 in B. K. Gold, ed. *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome*. Austin.
- . 1995. "Cleombrotus of Ambracia: Interpretations of a Suicide from Callimachus to Agathias." *CQ* 45: 154–69.
- Wilson, J. ["Christopher North"]. 1833. "The Greek Anthology." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 33: 865–88; 34: 115–40, 258–84, 373–428, and 961–98.
- Wilson, N. G. 1992. *From Byzantium to Italy: Greek Studies in the Italian Renaissance*. Baltimore.
- Wilson, P. 2003. "The Sound of Cultural Conflict: Kritias and the Culture of *Mousikē* in Athens." Pp. 181–206 in C. Dougherty and L. Kurke, eds. *The Cultures within Ancient Greek Culture. Contact, Conflict, Collaboration*. Cambridge.
- Winiarczyk, M. 2002. *Euhemerus von Messene: Leben, Werk und Nachwirkung*. Munich.
- Winkler, J. "Gardens of Nymphs: Public and Private in Sappho's Lyrics." Pp. 63–89 in H. Foley, ed. *Reflections of Women in Antiquity*. New York.
- Wiseman, T. P. 1974. *Cinna the Poet and other Roman essays*. Leicester.
- . 1982. "*Pete nobiles amicos*: Poets and Patrons in Late Republican Rome." Pp. 28–49 in B. K. Gold, ed. *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome*. Austin.
- . 1985. *Catullus and His World. A Reappraisal*. Cambridge.
- Wisse, J. 1989. *Ethos and Pathos from Aristotle to Cicero*. Amsterdam.
- Wißmann, J. 2002. "Hellenistic Epigrams as School-Texts in Classical Antiquity." Pp. 215–30 in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, G. C. Wakker, eds. *Hellenistic Epigrams*. Leuven.
- Woessner, H. P. 1978. *Lessing und das Epigramm*. Neuhausen am Rheinfall.
- Worman, N. 2001. "This Voice Which Is Not One: Helen's Verbal Guises in Homeric Epic." Pp. 19–37 in A. Lardinois and L. McClure, eds. *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society*. Princeton.
- . 2002. *The Cast of Character: Style in Greek Literature*. Austin.
- Wormell, D. E. W. 1935. "The Literary Tradition Concerning Hermias of Atarneus." *JCS* 5: 57–92.
- Wright, F. A. 1923. "The Women Poets of Greece." *Fortnightly Review* n.s. 113: 322–8.
- Wuttke, D. 1973. "Textkritisches Supplement zu Hartfelders Edition der Celtis-Epigramme." Pp. 105–30 in K. Heitmann and E. Schroeder, eds. *Renatae Litterae*. Frankfurt a. M.
- Yatromanolakis, D. 1999. "'Alexandrian Sappho' revisited." *HSPH* 99: 179–95.
- Ypsilanti, M. 2005. "Literary Loves as Cycles: From Meleager to Ovid." *AC* 74: 83–110.
- Yunis, H., ed. 2003. *Written Texts and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.
- Zanker, G. 1987. *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry: A Literature and Its Audience*. London.
- . 2003. "New Light on the Literary Category of Ekphrastic Epigram in Antiquity: The New Posidippus (Col. X 7–XI 19 P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)." *ZPE* 143: 59–62.
- . 2004. *Modes of Viewing in Hellenistic Poetry and Art*. Madison.
- Zanker, P. 1995. *Die Maske des Sokrates: Das Bild des Intellektuellen in der antiken Kunst*. Munich.
- Zicari, M. 1964. "Some Metrical and Prosodical Features of Catullus Poetry." *Phoenix* 18: 193–205.

INDEX OF EPIGRAMS DISCUSSED

- Aeschrion
 1 GP: 238, n. 19; 475, n. 30
- “Aeschylus”
 2 *FGE*: 527
- Alcaeus of Messene
 1 GP: 528
 13 GP: 467
 16 GP: 195; 253, n. 15
- Alphaeus
 6 GP *Garland*: 420–1
 9 GP *Garland*: 421
- Amyntes
 1 *FGE*: 150
 2 *FGE*: 150
- “Anacreon”
 1 *FGE*: 289
 6 *FGE*: 302–3
- Anonymous
 24 *FGE*: 124, n. 37
 25 *FGE*: 243, n. 33
 33 *FGE*: 441–2
 36a *FGE*: 429–30; 438
 36b *FGE*: 429–30; 438
 38 *FGE*: 379–80; 438–40
 45 *FGE*: 151
- Antipater of Sidon
 4 GP: 173, n. 23
 7 GP: 413
 11 GP: 440
 12 GP: 440
 13 GP: 444
 14 GP: 444
 15 GP: 444
 16 GP: 174; 444
 17 GP: 444
 18 GP: 436–7; 441
 21 GP: 150
 22 GP: 174
 25 GP: 425–6
 27 GP: 174, n. 25
- 31 GP: 90–1
 32 GP: 207–8
 34 GP: 431
 43 GP: 239
 48 GP: 150
 58 GP: 376–81
 60 GP: 453
 65 GP: 532
 67 GP: 174; 499
 73 GP: 440–1
- Antipater of Thessalonica
 4 GP *Garland*: 381–3
 17 GP *Garland*: 243, n. 33
 19 GP *Garland*: 441
 20 GP *Garland*: 178–9
 54 GP *Garland*: 173
 55 GP *Garland*: 415
 75 GP *Garland*: 437
 77 GP *Garland*: 498
 79 GP *Garland*: 306
 84 GP *Garland*: 268
 85 GP *Garland*: 418
 97 GP *Garland*: 500
 111 GP *Garland*: 424
- Antiphanes
 1 GP *Garland*: 426
 9 GP *Garland*: 178, n. 39
- Antiphrilus
 3 GP *Garland*: 159
 6 GP *Garland*: 159
 14 GP *Garland*: 248
 23 GP *Garland*: 315
 35 GP *Garland*: 417–8
 48 GP *Garland*: 244
- Anyte
 1 GP: 453–4
 3 GP: 336–7
 4 GP: 12, n. 49
 5 GP: 230
 8 GP: 196, n. 34
 9 GP: 340, n. 30
 16 GP: 338–40
 17 GP: 337–8; 340

18 GP: 334; 338; 450
 19 GP: 338–9; 350
 21 GP: 230–1

AP

2.127: 433
 2.383: 433
 6.49: 303–4
 6.76: 577
 6.87–108: 162, n. 38
 6.210–26: 157–8
 7.14: 432
 7.15: 434
 7.17: 433
 7.18: 432–3
 7.19: 432–3
 7.20: 434
 7.25: 432–3
 7.26: 432
 7.27: 432
 7.31: 433
 7.35: 432–3
 7.57: 432
 7.60–71: 433
 7.64 Anonymous: 497–8
 7.69 Julian: 465
 7.71 Gaetulicus: 464–5
 7.136–50: 412
 7.194–203: 156, n. 30
 7.233–40: 162, n. 38
 7.241–9: 207
 7.263–71: 156, n. 30
 7.351: 433
 7.401.7–8 Crinagoras: 71, n. 18
 7.405: 433
 7.407: 433
 7.408: 433
 7.507–16 “Simonides”: 127
 7.709: 433
 7.714: 432
 7.718: 432–3
 7.745: 433–4
 9.26: 433
 9.81–9: 162, n. 38
 9.152–5: 421–2
 9.190: 214–6
 9.239: 432
 9.403–23, 428–30: 162–3
 9.457–80: 423
 9.506: 433
 9.507: 441
 9.521: 432
 9.541–62: 162, n. 38
 9.575: 440

9.627: 580
 9.713–42, 793–8: 265–6
 9.716 “Anacreon”: 266, n. 77; 267
 10.12: 338
 11.23–46: 162, n. 38
 11.91–5: 368, n. 39
 11.112–6: 359
 11.117: 359
 11.118–22: 359
 11.125–6: 359
 11.318–27: 162, n. 38
 12.28: 205, n. 56
 14.56
 15.37 Cometas: 386
 16.53: 312
 16.54: 312
lemma ad 6.114: 150, n. 11
lemma ad 7.657: 73, n. 32
lemma ad 9.435: 73, n. 32
lemmata ad 11: 356–7
scholium ad 4.1: 152; 156

APl

135–43: 265
 305: 433

Archias

4 GP *Garland*: 173
 14 GP *Garland*: 498
 15 GP *Garland*: 415
 16 GP *Garland*: 414
 19 GP *Garland*: 307
 33 GP *Garland*: 195–6

“Aristotle”

1 *FGE*: 500

Asclepiades

1 GP: 450; 508–9
 2 GP: 450
 3 GP: 245–6; 318; 396
 4 GP: 316–7
 5 GP: 449
 6 GP: 238, n. 20; 311–2; 316
 8 GP: 320–1
 9 GP: 313; 319
 11 GP: 324
 12 GP: 246
 13 GP: 450
 14 GP: 324
 15 GP: 456
 16 GP: 454–5
 17 GP: 326
 18 GP: 237; 246

- 19 GP: 322
 25–6 GP: 172, n. 18; 329
 27 GP: 390; 479–80
 28 GP: 377–81; 478
 29 GP: 397; 413
 30 GP: 396
 32 GP: 478
 35 GP: 237–8; 311–2
 37 GP: 385
 39 GP: 208–9; 286–7
 43 GP: 243
- “Bacchylides”
 1 *FGE*: 576
- Bassus
 5 GP *Garland*: 421
- Callimachus
 1 GP: 327; 406–7
 2 GP: 485
 3 GP: 387–8; 427
 4 GP: 325–6; 477–8, n. 2; 534;
 539
 5 GP: 477–8, n. 2
 6 GP: 536
 7 GP: 325
 8 GP: 324
 9 GP: 324–5; 405–6
 11 GP: 313; 322; 547
 13 GP: 246; 323; 539
 14 GP: 16; 279
 22 GP: 204
 24 GP: 199–200
 25 GP: 84–5; 200–1; 308
 26 GP: 389–90; 479; 481–3
 27 GP: 480
 29 GP: 78–80
 30 GP: 78–80; 504
 32 GP: 291; 409
 34 GP: 166; 169; 326
 35 GP: 198–9; 241–2
 37 GP: 174, n. 25; 405
 40 GP: 203–4; 326
 43 GP: 288–9
 50 GP: 202–3; 242
 51 GP: 504–5
 52 GP: 504, n. 15
 53 GP: 80–3; 505–6
 54 GP: 506–7
 55 GP: 478
 56 GP: 171
 57 GP: 171; 484–5
 58 GP: 484; 486–7
- 59 GP: 369; 484–6
 64 GP: 504–5
- Calvus
 17–8 Morel: 538
- CEG*
 14: 38
 34: 31, n. 10
 51: 40; 120
 68: 40–1
 97: 217
 112.1: 527
 136.2: 11, n. 41
 190: 44–5
 227: 45–6
 362: 297
 363: 42
 383: 297–8
 432: 35–6
 436: 116, n. 12
 437: 116, n. 12
 470: 120
 517: 243, n. 33
 551: 245, n. 36
 722: 72, n. 26
 819.3: 6, n. 24
 820: 296
 827: 37–8
 828: 296
 855: 297
- CIL*
 I² 7: 521–5
 I² 9: 521–5
 I² 10.5: 529
 I² 14: 526
 I² 1570: 525–6
 3.21 and 6625: 558–9
 4.4971: 540
- Crinagoras
 2 GP *Garland*: 423
 7 GP *Garland*: 444–5
 11 GP *Garland*: 178, n. 39
 39 GP *Garland*: 158
 42 GP *Garland*: 173
- Damagetus
 8 GP: 396, n. 22
- Dioscorides
 1 GP: 172; 451
 2 GP: 419–20; 423

- 5 GP: 247; 450
 6 GP: 451
 7 GP: 389
 8 GP: 450-1
 14 GP: 279; 284
 17 GP: 472-4
 18 GP: 439-40; 447; 450-1
 19 GP: 443-4; 456
 20 GP: 487; 490; 495
 21 GP: 487-8; 490
 22 GP: 487-9; 490; 493
 23 GP: 487; 489-91; 493
 24 GP: 487; 494-
 26 GP: 238, n. 19; 475, n. 30
- Diotimus
 10 GP: 350
- Ennius
Var. 15-6 V²: 529
Var. 17-8 V²: 529-30
Var. 19-20 V²: 526-9
Var. 21-2 V²: 526-9
Var. 21-4 V²: 533
Var. 23-4 V²: 527-9
- Erinna
 1 GP: 217-23; 225
 2 GP: 217; 221-3; 225
 3 GP: 197-8; 223-5; 255-6; 268
- Erycius
 7 GP *Garland*: 350
- Euenus
 2 GP *Garland*: 421
- Euphorion
 1 GP: 167-8
- Flaccus
 6 GP *Garland*: 424-5
- Florus
 1 *FLP*: 554
- Geminus
 6 GP *Garland*: 270-1
- GG*
 188: 71, n. 16
- Glaucus
 3 GP *Garland*: 417
- GVI*
 1171: 60
 1171a and b: 60
 1344: 79-80
 1353: 71, n. 12
 1635: 193-4
 1881: 262-3
- Hadrian
 1 *FLP*: 554
 5 *FGE*: 554
 7 *FGE*: 553
- Hedylus
 2 GP: 236-7
 4 GP: 279; 284
 5 GP: 12-3
 10 GP: 179, n. 43
 11 GP: 358-9
- Hegesippus
 6 GP: 150
- Heraclitus
 1 GP: 205-6; 253, n. 15
- Hermocreon
 1 GP: 340
- Honestus
 2 GP *Garland*: 498
- Inscriptions du colosse de Memnon*
 30 Bernand: 556
 31 Bernand: 556-60
- IG*
 II 2.4714: 84, n. 60
 IV.53: 89
 IX 2.146: 84, n. 60
 IX 1ⁱ, 17A.24: 14
 XI 4 1105: 9-10
 XII 9.290: 72-3, n. 29
 2².212.30-3: 121, n. 28
- [Ion]
 1 *FGE*: 174, n. 25
- Leonidas of Tarentum
 3 GP: 344-5
 5 GP: 343-4
 6 GP: 341-2
 7 GP: 510
 12 GP: 72-5

- 13 GP: 76
 19 GP: 345–6; 350
 20 GP: 242; 510
 25 GP: 453
 27 GP: 340–1
 30 GP: 380
 31 GP: 251, n. 3; 263; 388; 443
 37 GP: 511
 43 GP: 238
 47 GP: 173; 342–3
 51 GP: 150
 54 GP: 499
 55 GP: 510
 58 GP: 466–7
 59 GP: 242; 498–9
 62 GP: 179
 70 GP: 87–9; 150
 72 GP: 240–1; 510
 75 GP: 510
 77 GP: 510–1
 79 GP: 510
 81 GP: 342
 82 GP: 344–5
 88 GP: 266, n. 77; 267
 90 GP: 251, n. 3; 443
 93 GP: 511
 99 GP: 435
- Lucilius
 fr. 579–80 Marx: 530
 fr. 581–4 Marx: 531
- Lucillius
 AP 11.78: 435
 AP 11.84: 308–9
 AP 11.137.3: xi
 AP 11.140: 367; 328, n. 38
 AP 11.141: 367
 AP 11.153: 500
 AP 11.160: 368
 AP 11.312: 198
- Lutatius Catulus
 1.1–2 Courtney: 539
 1 Morel: 533–4
 2 Morel: 531; 533
- Marcus Argentarius
 10 GP *Garland*: 384–90
- Martial
 4.23: 545
 11.21: 562
 11.69: 561–3
- 11.90.4: 530
 11.102: 562–3
- Meleager
 1 GP: 10, n.40; 140; 152–4; 168; 175;
 177; 444
 2–5 GP: 151
 10 GP: 332; 448–9
 20 GP: 386, n. 29; 456
 22 GP: 449–50
 26 GP: 181–2
 27 GP: 92; 331
 28 GP: 92; 331
 29 GP: 332
 32 GP: 332
 34 GP: 332
 38 GP: 329–30
 41 GP: 247
 43 GP: 332
 44 GP: 332
 46 GP: 175
 47 GP: 332
 50 GP: 174, n. 25
 54 GP: 332
 55 GP: 327
 56 GP: 332
 59 GP: 313
 69 GP: 536
 71 GP: 328–9
 72 GP: 181–2
 76 GP: 332
 86 GP: 388
 91 GP: 332
 102 GP: 181–2
 103 GP: 332
 110–1 GP: 252, n. 10
 104 GP: 332
 113 GP: 338
 114 GP: 174, n. 25
 120 GP: 453
 122 GP: 532
 126 GP: 89
 128 GP: 181–2
 129 GP: 140; 174, n. 25
 132 GP: 473–4
- Mnasalces
 8 GP: 350
- Mundus
 1 GP *Garland*: 420
- Nicaenetus
 5 GP: 477–8, n. 2

- Nicarchus
2 GP: 239
- Nicias
5 GP: 339–40
7 GP: 340, n. 28
- Nossis
1 GP: 226; 450
2 GP: 227–9
4 GP: 287
6 GP: 256–7
9 GP: 244–5
10 GP: 477–8, n. 2
11 GP: 226; 440; 444–5; 452; 494,
n. 36
- Parmenion
11 GP *Garland*: 310–1
13 GP *Garland*: 369
- Phalaecus
1 GP: 238, n. 20
3 GP: 477–8, n. 2
- Phanias
2 GP: 238–9
3 GP: 239
- Philetas of Samos
2 GP: 77–8
- Philip
1 GP *Garland*: 140; 159–61; 163;
176–7
2 GP *Garland*: 158
3 GP *Garland*: 158
4 GP *Garland*: 158
6 GP *Garland*: 158
15 GP *Garland*: 172
23 GP *Garland*: 305
33 GP *Garland*: 315
34 GP *Garland*: 162; 466–7
51 GP *Garland*: 162
57 GP *Garland*: 158–9
58 GP *Garland*: 365
59 GP *Garland*: 365
60–1 GP *Garland*: 158; 178, n. 39;
365–6
61 GP *Garland*: 368
68 GP *Garland*: 162
75 GP *Garland*: 162
80 GP *Garland*: 365
- Philodemus
2 GP *Garland*: 513
10 GP *Garland*: 513
11 GP *Garland*: 513
12 GP *Garland*: 513
17 GP *Garland*: 515–6
18 GP *Garland*: 516–7
23 GP *Garland*: 514–5
27 GP *Garland*: 513
- Pinytus
1 GP *Garland*: 441
- “Plato”
5 *FGE*: 201
8 *FGE*: 238
13 *FGE*: 438
21 *FGE*: 174, n. 25
- Pollianus
AP 11.127: 366
AP 11.128: 366
AP 11.130: 366–7
- Pompeius
2 GP *Garland*: 421
- Porcius Licinius
6 Morel: 534
- Posidippus
4–7 AB: 142
5 AB: 399
6 AB: 144
7 AB: 144
9 AB: 285; 455, n. 119; 457, n. 125
10 AB: 398
11 AB: 400
13 AB: 400
14 AB: 398
15 AB: 142; 401–2
17 AB: 144–5; 170
18 AB: 145; 171; 179, n. 43
19 AB: 145; 174, n. 25; 398; 402–4;
427
20 AB: 145
25 AB: 170
32 AB: 144
33 AB: 144
34 AB: 145
35 AB: 145
36 AB: 279; 283
37 AB: 457

- 36-9 AB: 145
 37 AB: 279; 282
 38 AB: 279
 39 AB: 279-84
 40 AB: 145
 41 AB: 145
 42 AB: 290
 42-61 AB: 363
 47 AB: 290
 48 AB: 243
 50 AB: 289
 51 AB: 451-2
 55 AB: 452
 56 AB: 144
 57 AB: 144
 59-61 AB: 144
 62 AB: 144-5
 63 AB: 10; 144; 243-4; 258-60; 268
 64 AB: 144; 416-8
 64-6 AB: 144-5
 65 AB: 142; 144; 243
 66 AB: 144
 67 AB: 144
 68 AB: 144
 70 AB: 144-5
 71 AB: 303, n. 24
 72 AB: 245
 78 AB: 10; 275
 78-82 AB: 144
 95 AB: 170
 95-9 AB: 145
 97 AB: 144; 363
 98 AB: 144
 99-101 AB: 137-8
 100 AB: 145
 101 AB: 145
 102-9 AB: 235; 363
 103 AB: 363
 110 AB: 143
 115 AB: 170; 282
 116 AB: 170; 279-82; 284
 118 AB: 15-6
 119 AB: 279-84
 121 AB: 172, n. 18
 122 AB: 170-1; 432; 439; 447;
 452
 123 AB: 509
 124 AB: 329
 127 AB: 238; 311-2; 316
 129 AB: 449
 130 AB: 247-8
 141 AB: 286-7
 142 AB: 260-2
 144 AB: 413, n. 12
 11-2 GP: 132-3, n. 15
 Rhianus
 5 GP: 327
 Rufinus
 28 Page: 175
 SEG
 41.540A: 30-1
 SGO
 01/12/02: 175
 01/12/05: 64
 08/08/10: 86-9
 18/14/01: 192-4
 19/10/01: 90-1
 SH
 961: 12, n. 47; 25; 132, n. 13
 980: 477-8, n. 2
 985: 478
 Simias
 1 GP: 393; 395
 2 GP: 393; 395
 3 GP: 393-5
 5 GP: 481-2
 "Simonides"
 1 FGE: 114, n. 4; 119, n. 23; 120
 3 FGE: 51; 126, n. 41; 388, n. 33
 4 FGE: 51, 53
 6 FGE: 51; 122
 14 FGE: 125
 17a FGE: 53-4; 121-2
 19 FGE: 117, n. 16
 20 FGE: 53
 22a FGE: 51; 122
 22b FGE: 51; 122
 26a FGE: 53; 65; 66-7, n. 72; 123-4
 26b FGE: 54
 29 FGE: 120
 30 FGE: 299-300
 31 FGE: 301-2
 40 FGE: 58
 41 FGE: 65; 67, n. 73; 125
 42 FGE: 300-1
 44 FGE: 114, n. 4
 55 FGE: 120-1
 66 FGE: 174, n. 25; 442-4
 67 FGE: 442-3

- 75 *FGE*: 119–20
 84 *FGE*: 119
 89 *FGE*: 114, n. 4; 117, n. 16
 Socles
 6 GP: 445, n. 76
 Theaetetus
 6 GP: 179, n. 43
 “Theocritus”
 1 *FGE*: 500
 2 GP: 240
 4 GP: 477–8, n. 2
 6 GP: 347
 11 GP: 243, n. 33
 13 GP: 396, n. 22; 469–70
 14 GP: 461; 470
 15 GP: 264–5; 443
 17 GP: 477–8, n. 2
 19 GP: 348
 20 GP: 171–2; 401, n. 49
 21 GP: 339; 349
 22 GP: 349
 Trajan
 1 *FGE*: 550–2
 Tullius Laurea
 1 GP *Garland*: 441
 Valerius Aedituus
 1 Morel: 534; 536
 2 Morel: 534

INDEX OF ANCIENT PASSAGES DISCUSSED

- Aelius
Progymn. 118.7–120.11 (Spengel 2):
 251, n. 4
- Aeschines
In Ctes. 183: 58
- Aeschylus
PV 460–1: 224
- Alcaeus
 fr. 38 V: 13; 455
 fr. 335 V: 455
 fr. 346 V: 13; 455
 fr. 366 V: 453
 fr. 368 V: 453
- Anacreon
 fr. 4 *PMG*: 451
 fr. 55 *PMG*: 451
 fr. 357 *PMG*: 456–7
 fr. 358 *PMG*: 456
 fr. 360 *PMG*: 456–7
 fr. 373.2–3 *PMG*: 13
 fr. 398 *PMG*: 456
 fr. 428 *PMG*: 536
- Ananias
 fr. 5 W: 97
- Aphthonius
Progymn.
 11: 235, n. 6
 46.15–49.2 (Spengel 2): 251, n. 4
- Apollodorus
 1.45.2–4: 224
- Apollonius of Rhodes
Argonautica
 1.495: 383
 1.540: 383
 4.891–98: 220
- Apuleius
Apol. 9.6: 531
- Archilochus
 fr. 1 W: 98
 fr. 5 W: 97; 227–8
 fr. 8–12 W: 105
 fr. 13 W: 105
 fr. 23 W: 97
 fr. 24 W: 105
 fr. 31–47 W: 97–8
 fr. 48 W: 97
 fr. 196 and 196a W: 98
 fr. 196a W: 450
Telephus: 104
- Aristarchus
 Σ A ad Λ101: 133, n. 20
- Aristophanes Comicus
Clouds
 819: 488
 966–8: 435
 1004: 488
 1121: 488
Frogs
 117–35: 82
- Aristophanes Grammaticus
ap. Eust. *Od.* 1761.25: 125
ap. Eust. *Od.* 1761.25.1–2: 66,
 n. 70
- Aristotle
EE
 1214a5: 65
EN
 1099a25: 65
 1110a8: 262, n. 54
 1214a5: 65
 1361a34: 380
GA
 717b17: 401, n. 38
Hymn to Virtue (= 842 *PMG*):
 500
Met.
 985a–b: 503
Po.
 1449a14–5: 491

- 1449b24: 233
 1449b36–50a7: 233
 1450a23–9: 233
 1450a38–50b12: 233
 1454b8–15: 233
 1460a5–11: 233
Rh.
 1365a24–67b18: 65
 1365a26: 125
 1367b: 55, n. 27
 1367b17–26: 66–7
 1367b18–21: 66
 1367b20: 65
 1.2.4: 234, n. 4
 2.12–7: 235
 3.7.6–7: 235
 Artemidorus
Onir. 1.4: 111
 Athen. *Deipnosophistae*
 4.45: 151, n. 15
 7.281e: 502
 10.454f: 124, n. 73
 11.107: 151, n. 15
 13.573c: 125
 13.600d: 442
 BKT V 1.75 f.: 155
CAG Suppl. 1.1: 114, n. 3
 Callimachus
 fr. 1.11–12 Pf.: 110
 fr. 1.25–28 Pf.: 486
 fr. 1.29 Pf.: 379
 fr. 43.46–53 Pf.: 165–6
 fr. 64 Pf.: 421
 fr. 191.92–3 Pf.: 511–2
 fr. 192.12–3 Pf.: 478, n. 6
 fr. 215 Pf.: 478, n. 6
 fr. 228 Pf.: 288
 fr. 393–402 Pf.: 133, n. 19
Hy.
 2.19: 383
 5.2: 312
Iambi
 1: 471–2
 13: 471–2
 13.13–4, 65–66: 446, n. 80
SH 254.2: 290
 Catullus
 1: 538
 1–60: 537
 2–3: 549
 6: 539
 7: 547
 13: 540
 15: 547, n. 6
 16: 538
 22: 538
 26: 540
 32: 540
 35: 538
 36: 538
 38.7–8: 547–8
 41: 540
 43: 540
 50: 538
 51: 534; 536
 68: 537
 68.73–86: 315
 69–116: 536–7; 540
 70: 313–4; 536
 75: 537
 76: 536–7
 80: 538–9
 83: 536
 85: 537
 86: 536
 87: 536–7
 92: 536
 95: 538; 546
 96: 538
 97: 539
 98: 539
 99: 535–6
 101: 538; 559
 109: 537
 116: 538
Cert. Hom. et Hes.
 15: 60
 Chamaeleon
 fr. 41–3 Giordano: 125, n. 39
 Cicero
ad familiares 2.13: 480
Brut. 132: 532
De or. 3.194: 532; 540
Fin. 2.116: 524
in Pisonem
 13: 517
 22: 517
 67: 517
 70–2: 517

- Nat. deor.* 1.79: 539
pro Arch.
 6: 532
 25: 545; 548–9
Tusc. 1.13: 524
- Critias
 fr. 6 W: 97
- Demetrius
On Style 208–22: 319–21
- Diogenes Laertius
 4.49: 510
 5.6–7: 500
 5.11: 501
 7.27: 509
 9.105: 512
 9.115: 504
- Dionysius Chalcos
 fr. 1 W: 97
 fr. 3 W: 97
 fr. 4 W: 97
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus
De comp. verb. 12: 262, n. 55
Isocrates 11: 234, n. 4
Lysias 8: 234, n. 4
Th. VI: 54
- Ennius
Ann.
 348 V²: 531
- Erinna
Distaff: 213–6
SH 400–2: 376
SH 410: 214, n. 21
- Euenus
 fr. 8a W: 97
- Euphorion
 fr. 84 Powell: 167
- Euripides
Bacch. 494: 483
Ion 184–237: 287
Medea 1019–80: 265
Phaethon 240: 9, n. 36
Tr.
 9–14: 418, n. 28
 1188–91: 64–5
- Galen
Protr. 2: 438
- Gellius
 1.24.1–4: 529
 19.9: 531
- Hephaestio Grammaticus
Ench. 4.6: 114, n. 4
- Heraclitus
 fr. B 29 D–K: 126, n. 41
 fr. B 43 D–K: 126, n. 41
- Hermesianax
 fr. 7.35–8: 98
 fr. 7.38: 110
- Hermogenes
Progymn.
 9: 235
 16.11–17.8 (Spengel 2): 251, n. 4
- Horace
ars 450: 429
Epodes 14.9–12: 444
Odes
 1.32.5–12: 452
 2.13.22: 442
 3.30: 559
- Herodotus
 1.124.3: 192, n. 23
 4.88: 51
 5.35: 192, n. 23
 5.59–61: 51
 5.77: 51, 52
 5.95.2: 455
 5.102: 122
 7.228: 51–3; 56–7; 59; 122
 8.22.1–3: 192, n. 23
- Hesiod
 fr. 68 M–W: 220, n. 36
Theogony
 39: 437
 95: 383
Works and Days
 530: 395
- Hipponax
 fr. 11–25 W: 98
 fr. 84 W: 98
 fr. 92 W: 98

Historia Augusta

16.3–4; 554

Homer

Iliad

1.106: 396

2.695–710: 415

2.721–5: 417

3.139–40: 214

3.182: 9, n. 36

3.213–23: 377–80

4.105–13: 394

4.118: 394

4.122: 394

4.123: 394

4.125: 394

6.201: 398

6.357–8: 11

7.86–91: 412

7.303–5: 423

9.9: 397

9.186: 383

9.678: 126, n. 41

10.431: 398

11.101: 413, n. 12

12.445–6: 404, n. 48

13.126–8: 10, n. 37

13.476: 417

13.799: 402

14.33: 114, n. 5

14.214–23: 426–7

14.236–7: 382

14.267–8: 382

14.275–6: 382

14.315–28: 427

14.353: 382

16.134: 399

17.398–9: 10, n. 37

17.432: 304

17.747–53: 414

18.23–4: 426

18.34: 398

18.370: 399

18.576: 401

20.389–92: 412

21.16: 401

21.598: 406

22.405–11: 426

23.262–652: 304

23.701: 501

Odyssey

1.53: 383

1.59: 383

1.391: 386

3.435–8: 42–3

5.467: 306

5.488–90: 405–6

6.32: 405

8.248: 383

9.5–11: 514

9.240: 403

9.240–2: 427

9.313: 403

9.340: 403

10.247: 397

10.463: 401

11.379: 502

11.611: 396

12.158–200: 219–20

14.353: 395

17.5: 406

18.300: 42, n. 52

19.257: 42, n. 52

h.Ap.

131: 383

Hyginus

Fab. 141: 220

Ion of Chios

fr. 27.7 W: 13

Laevius

fr. 28 Morel: 540

Libanius

Progymn. 853–4 (Reiske 4): 251, n. 4

Livy

38.53.8: 528

Lucan

BC 9.950–99: 422

Lucian

hist. conscr. 8: 492

Lycophron

990: 394, n. 14

Menander

Perikeromene 467–85: 328

Mimnermus

fr. 1 W: 110

fr. 5 W: 98–9; 110

fr. 6 W: 110

- Moschus
Epit. Bion 90: 444
- Nicolaus Sophistes
Progymn.
 11: 235, n. 6
 67.16–71.5 Felten: 252, n. 4
- Ovid
am.
 1.13: 92
 2.6: 92
Ars
 3.330: 444
Her.
 13
Met.
 5.551–63: 220
 13.390: 415
 15.420–35: 422
Rem. 3.762: 444
Trist. 2.363–4: 444
- PHerc. 1232 fr. 8 col. 1: 515, n. 53
- PHerc. 1424, col. 23.22–36: 515
- PKöln V 204: 149–50
- PLouvre 7172: 25
- POxy. 31.2535: 126, n. 41
- POxy. 662: 150
- POxy. 2087.22: 506
- POxy. 2433: 127, n. 47
- POxy. 3324: 155
- POxy. LXVI 4502: 360, n. 18; 364, n. 29
- P. Vindob. G. 4061: 12, n. 47; 133
- Pausanias
 1.8.4.9: 436
 3.8.2: 121
 6.9.9: 120
- Philodemus
On Household Management PHerc. 1424, col. 23.22–36: 515
- On Poetry* col. ix 10–24: 234
- Photius 114a19–b22: 114, n. 3
- Pindar
Isthm. 4.51: 437
Nem. 5.1: 223, n. 43
Nem. 8.13–6: 43
Ol. 1.14–7: 13, n. 50
Ol. 6.23: 484
Paeon 7b: 484
Pyth. 3.89–91: 437
- Plato
Epist. 13.363: 506, n. 25
Hipp. 228e: 60; 63–4
Laws 958e: 2, n. 5
Phaedo
 59c: 505
 61c: 81
Phaedr. 264c–d: 60–1
Resp. 5337–d2: 501
Symp.
 174a: 499
 218c–218e: 499
Ti. 34a5: 401, n. 38
- Pliny the Younger
Epist.
 4.14.9: 540
 5.3: 532
- [Plutarch]
de mus.
 14.168: 444
 19.14: 444
Malign. Hdt. 36.869c: 117, n. 16
mor. 1030a7: 436
- Polybius
 12.13.3: 480
- Propertius
 4.11.21: 74, n. 35
- Quintilian
Inst. or.
 1.4.3: 429
 3.8.51: 235
 10.1.54: 429
 10.1.61: 429
- Σ
ad Od. 5.467: 406

- ad Od.* 9.151: 405
ad Od. 12.7: 405
ad Od. 17.25: 406
 Ariston *ad Il.* 1.106c: 396
 Ariston *ad Il.* 9.9b: 397
 BQ *ad* 10.463: 401
 D *ad Il.* 1.98: 395, n. 16
 D *ad Il.* 1.106: 396
 D *ad Il.* 10.44: 400
 D *ad Il.* 13.137: 403
 D *ad Il.* 13.799: 302
 D *ad Il.* 17.521: 394
 Did *ad Il.* 10.431c1
 Did *ad Il.* 11.101a: 397–8
 ex *ad Il.* 9.125a: 398–9
 ex *ad Il.* 13.137c: 403
 ex *ad Il.* 13.799b: 302
 ex *ad Il.* 16.134a1: 399, n. 34
 ex *ad Il.* 21.598: 306
 H *ad Od.* 5.194: 400
 Q *ad Od.* 9.240: 403
 Q *ad Od.* 9.295: 403
 Q *ad Od.* 14.353: 395, n. 17
 V *ad Od.* 8.257: 400
 [Opp.] C. 1.516: 166, n. 2
 in A. R. 4.892: 220, n. 36
 in Pind. *Ol.* 13.32b: 125
- Sappho
 fr. 1 V: 536
 fr. 1.4 V: 447; 451
 fr. 2 V: 450
 fr. 2.1–2 V: 447
 fr. 5 V: 446
 fr. 16 V: 229, n. 51
 fr. 31 V: 449; 534; 536
 fr. 31.1 V: 447
 fr. 44.9 V: 452, n. 101
 fr. 48 V: 449
 fr. 58 V: 451
 fr. 63.8 V: 452, n. 101
 fr. 96.8 V: 451
 fr. 104 V: 452
 fr. 114 V: 450
 fr. 151 V: 450
- Semonides
 fr. 16–8 W: 98
- Sextus Empiricus
adversus Mathematicos
 1.310: 505
 1.311–2: 505
 3.2: 512
- Simonides
 fr. 21 W: 99
 fr. 22 W: 99; 105; 108
 fr. 22.9–12 W: 99
 fr. 26 W: 114, n. 5
 fr. 88 W: 117, n. 16
 fr. 531.9 *PMG*: 126, n. 41
 fr. 581 *PMG*: 421
- Solon
 fr. 13 W: 104
 fr. 22a W: 98
 fr. 23 W: 98
 fr. 25 W: 98
 fr. 26 W: 98
Salamis: 104
- Sophocles
Ajax
 661–6: 423
 1028–39: 423
- Statius
Silv. 4.3.156–7: 165
- Stobaeus
 1.8.22: 114, n. 4
- Strabo
 14.1.30: 442
 14.1.41: 234
- Suetonius
Nero 39: 552
- Theocritus and [Theocritus]
Idylls
 1.1: 334
 1.1–12: 348
 1.12: 349
 1.85: 388
 6.7: 388
 7.44: 268, n. 83
 7: 134
 7.100–1: 10, n. 37
 10: 335
 11: 388
 11.12: 351
 11.54–62: 427
 16.8–13: 445
 16.44: 452, n. 100
 17.2, 6: 275, n. 1
 17.130: 291
 18.31: 451

- 25.208: 172
 29.1-4: 453
- Theognidea*
 1-4: 105
 11-4: 105
 15-8: 105
 87-90: 386
 94-100: 105
 237-54: 108
 237-56: 110
 261-2: 100
 265-6: 100
 323-8: 106
 447-52: 106
 467-96: 105; 111
 503-8: 106
 511-22: 105
 549-54: 106
 667-82: 105; 108; 111
 789-94: 106
 805-10: 106
 879-84: 106
 903-30: 111
 949-50: 101-2
 949-54: 100-1
 993-1002: 101; 105
 1017-22: 106
 1091-4: 536-7
 1123-8: 106
 1196-1202: 106
 1211-6: 106
 1231-4: 102
 1249-52: 105
 1259-62: 105
 1263-6: 105
 1271-4: 105
 1283-96: 105
 1295-8: 105
 1311-8: 105
- 1323-6: 536
 1327-34: 105
 1341-50: 105
- Thucydides
 1.132.2: 53
 6.54.5-7: 53
 6.59.2: 123-4
 6.59.2-3: 53
- Timon of Phlius
Silloi
SH 781: 502
SH 791: 502
SH 803: 502-3
SH 806: 504
SH 810: 501
SH 811: 503
SH 816: 503
SH 817: 503
- Trypho
 Περὶ Τρόπων: 114, n. 4
- Tyrtaeus
 fr. 12 W: 104
- Varro
Ling. Lat. 7.28: 540
- vers. pop. in Caes.*
 1-2 Morel: 538
 7 Morel: 538
- Xenophanes
 fr. 1 W: 97; 108
 fr. B 1: 105

GENERAL SUBJECT INDEX

Words in Greek may be found at the end of this list. Epigrammatists and other ancient authors, papyri and manuscripts should also be searched in the Index of Epigrams Discussed and the Index of Ancient Passages Discussed.

- Abbruchsformel*, 177
 Achilles, 36, 412–5, 425
 act of reading, 187–8, 202–10, 224;
 as work, 189; neurological process,
 190; *see also* reading
 act of thinking, 202–3, 207–10
 act of writing, 187, 189, 202; as labor,
 200; *see also* *gramma*, *graphein*, writing
ad hominem attacks, 500–3
 Adaeus, dates, 160
 Adonia, 287
 Aelius Aristides, 118 n. 20
 Aemilianus, dates, 160
 Aemilius Scaurus, M., 532
aemulatio, 254; and ecphrastic epigram,
 263; *see also* *imitatio*, *variatio*
 Aeschines, and epigrams, 58–9;
 source of epigrams in, 58; and Eion
 epigrams, 59
 Aeschylus, 459, 487–9
 aesthetics, 506–9, 511–2; of art, 259
 Agathias, 21; source in Cephalas, 154
aidōs, 214–6, 223; *see also* Erinna
aischrologia, 462
 Ajax, 413–5; 423
 Alamanni, Luigi, 580
 Alcaeus of Messene, 148, 194–5, 207–8;
 dates, 147; as imitator of Leonidas,
 148; metrics, 181
 Alcaeus, lyric poet, 13, 97, 152,
 429–30, 452–5; erotic poetry of,
 452; Horace's characterization of,
 452; political poetry of, 453;
 symptotic poetry of, 455; Theocritus'
 adaptation of, 453
 Alciato, Andrea, 570, 575, 581
 Alexander Aetolus, 152; dates, 147;
 relationship of with Macedonian
 court, 153
 Alexander the Great, 5, 144, 278, 282,
 286 n. 40
 Alexandria, Alexandrian, 69, 275–88
 Alexandrian Library, 131
 Alexandrianism, 178, 183
 allusion, literary, 304, 311–2, 373–90;
 mythological, 307; to work of art,
 252; *see also* hypotext, intertextuality,
 intratextuality
 amateur epigram, 4 n. 19, 531–6, 540
 amatory epigram, *see* epigram, erotic
 Amboise, Michel d', 580
 Ambracia (Arta) cenotaph, 30–1, 38–40
amicitia, 293
 Amphictyony, 53, 57; *see also* Herodotus,
 Thucydides
 Amyntes, 150
 Anacreon, 13, 96–7, 118, 147, 152, 285
 n. 34, 375, 433, 442–5, 455–7, 478
 n. 3; epigrams on, 174, 189; narrative
 voice of, 456; poetic dialect of, 456;
 poetry of and Hellenistic epigram,
 455–6; epigrams ascribed to, 267,
 447; ecphrastic epigrams on, 263–5;
 dialect of, 265; caricatured, 265
Anacreonteia, 116
Anathematika, *see* epigrams, dedicatory;
 P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309
 Andocides, 58
Andriantopoiika, *see* ecphrasis; epigram,
 ecphrastic
 Angeriano, Girolamo, 576
 Annii Florus, 554
 announcement (herald's), 36–7;
 see also athletes
 anonymity, 193, 204; of dead, 71,
 73; of speaker, 89; *see also* epigram,
 inscriptional
 Antagoras, 153; dates, 147; relationship
 of with Macedonian court, 153
 anthology, 150–1; meaning of term,
 149; *see also* bookroll and collections
 anticipation of reader's thoughts, 193–4
 Antigoniids, 277 n. 9
 Antigonus, epigrammatist, 160
 Antimachus of Colophon, 110, 478 n. 3
 Antinous, 556

- Antiochus II, 278 n. 12
 Antipater of Sidon, 90, 148, 150, 152–3; 173–4, 207–8, 292, 376–81, 478 n. 3; dates, 147, 152; metrics, 181; and Roman culture, 532–3, 540–1
 Antipater of Thessalonica, 160–1, 173, 293, 381–3; dates, 160; Doric epigrams of, 178; metrics, 182; distaste of for Alexandrian poetry, 183; epigram of on art and poetry, 268; use of philosophy in, 498
 Antiphanes, 160, 178
 Antiphrilos, 160–1, 176; dates, 160; Doric epigrams of, 178; metrics, 182
 Antisthenes, 503
 Antistius, 160–1; dates, 160
 Anyte, 148, 152, 167–8, 227, 229–31; dates, 147; metrics, 181; and authentic female perspective, 229, 230–1; and the female voice, 226, 230–1; self-conscious manipulation of male voice in, 229–31; transgendered poetics and epigram books of, 229–31; companion epigrams in, 230–1; influence of Erinna on, 229–30; influence of on Theocritus, 334
 Apame, 290 n. 54
 Aphrodite, 214, 282–3, 286–7, 311, 426–7, 433, 438 n. 42, 442; temple of, in Nossis, 257; Urania, 279, 284, 291; *see also* Arsinoe Aphrodite
 Apollo, 304
 Apollonides, 160–1; dates, 160; metrics, 182
 Apollonius of Rhodes, 220, 276, 392, 395 n. 19, 397 n. 24, 404, 407 n. 53
 apostrophe, 224, 257
 Aratus, 153; dates, 147; relationship of with Macedonian court, 153; epigrams on, 171, 189
 Arcesilaus, 504
 Archedice, 53–5, 65–6, 124
 Archias, 173, 195–6, 293, 548–9; and Roman culture, 532, 544
 Archilochus, 96–100, 104–5, 147, 152, 178, 227–8, 375, 459–76; and Catullus, 538
 Archimelus, 16
 Ares, 452
 Argentarius, 175; Doric epigrams of, 178
argutia, 187, 560–2
 Arion, 285 n. 34, 457
 Aristarchus of Samothrace, 392, 394 n. 15, 396–8, 402 n. 42, 404, 406–7, 478
 Aristeides, orator, 53
 Aristippus, 81 n. 51
 aristocratic Roman culture, and Greek epigram, 521–6, 531, 534–5, 540
 Aristophanes, comic poet, 111, 212
 Aristophanes of Byzantium, 125, 392 n. 4, 407 n. 54
 Aristotle, 55, 65–7, 110, 123–5, 500–1, 503; use of epigrams in, 65–7; use of inscriptions in, 123–4; sources of epigrams, 65–6; and *Syll.Sim.*, 66; on character, 223–4; *Poetics* (*see* tragedy, history of and satyr drama, history of)
 arrangement, principles of, 131–46; symmetry in, 144; similarity in, 144; based upon arrangement of artworks, 257
 Arsinoe Aphrodite, 278–86, 291; *see also* Arsinoe Zephyritus and Zephyritis
 Arsinoe I, 132, 290 n. 54
 Arsinoe II Philadelphus, 132, 166, 277 n. 7, 278–88, 290–1
 Arsinoe Zephyritis, 276 n. 5, 278–86; *see also* Arsinoe Aphrodite
 Arsinoeion, 283 n. 27
 art, works of, 252; as representation of poetry, 257; aesthetics of, and poetry, 223–5, 259, 266; reciprocity of with poetry, 259; poetry as imitation of, 259–60; epigrams on, 243–5; *see also* ecphrasis; epigram, ecphrastic
 Artemis Orthoia, 74
 artistic values, as subject of ecphrastic epigram, 223–5, 253; *see also* epigram, ecphrastic
 artistry, 30–1, 41–5; *see also* *ἄγαλμα*, *χαίρω/χαίρις*, emotional heightening, effects/efficacy
 artists, praised by epigrammatists, 223–5, 254
 Asclepiades of Samos, 5–6, 73, 148, 153, 167–70, 177, 208, 314, 315–21, 322, 327, 329, 377, 379, 381, 385, 392, 396–7, 407; length of epigrams in, 106–10; epigrams of chiefly erotic, 5; relationship of with Ptolemies, 153; metrics, 181; testimonia, 14–5; dates, 147; called Sicelides, 153; and theater, 477–81, 495; figure of Eros in, 456;

- allusions to Alcaeus, 454–5; allusions to Sappho, 449; use of philosophy in, 508–9
- Asclepius, 84, 145, 199
- ascription, 115
- assonance, 301–2
- Astydamas, 478
- Athena, 44, 282–3, 304, 312
- Athenaeus, 23, 105
- Athens, inscriptions at, 3, 51, 53, 58–9, 63–4
- athletes, 36, 65–7, 144; dedications of, 33, 36–7; *see also* announcement
- athletic events: boxing, 297–8, 301–2, 309; chariot race, 296, 303–4; horse-racing, 302–3, 307, 311–2; pankration, 297, 302 n. 20; pentathlon, 300–1, 308–9; stadion, 297, 303 n. 24, 305, 306, 309–10 n. 37, 310, 312; wrestling, 299–300
- Attalids, 9, 277 n. 9
- audible thought, 210; *see also* act of thinking
- audience, 275–94
- Augustine, 81
- aulos*, associated with elegy, 383
- Ausonius (and pseudo-Ausonius), 566
- author, 187–8; interplay of with reader, 187–9, 202; absence of, 200; name of, 201; masked, 206; *see also* *gramma* and *graphie*
- author-headings, 142
- authorship of inscribed poems, 116 n. 13, 122–3
- autobiography, in Rome, 532
- Automedon, 160
- Bacchylides, 118 n. 18, 152, 285 n. 34, 375, 429–30
- Bacchylis, 147
- Baïf, Jean-Antoine de, 577, 580
- Bassus, 160–1; dates, 160
- Batiushkov, Konstantin Nikolaevich, 582
- Battle of Actium, 158
- Battus, 78–9
- beautiful death, 34, 41–2
- Berenice, 97, 144; Berenice I, 286–7, 290; Berenice II, 275, 278, 286–7, 290
- Bes, 284
- Bianor, 160, 176; dates, 160; metrics, 182
- biography of poets, and epigram, 530
- Bion of Borysthenes, 510
- BKT V 1.75, 155
- Boeotians, 51, 62
- Boethus, dates, 160
- Boileau-Despréaux, Nicolas, 572, 573
- book culture vs. song culture, 212
- book, 187; *see also* anthology and collections
- bookroll, 140
- book-tag epigrams, 189
- Bosch, Hieronymus de, 578
- Bouhours, Dominique, 572
- boundary stones, 90–1
- Bourbon, Nicolas, 577
- brevity, 70, 177, 199; programmatic, 301, 310–11
- bride/corpse theme, 220–3, 225, 229
- Brunck, Richard, 565
- Buchanan, George, 579
- bucolic, 333–51; epigram, 89; epigram and inscriptional tradition, 336; themes in epigram, 336; markers of bucolicity, 335; rural, life, 343; rural world, 335–6, 346; rural epigrams, 335; and urban world, 345; refreshment, theme of, as marker of bucolicity, 337–8, 341, 351; gardener in, 341–2; herdsmen in, 336–7, 339, 342; and term pastoral, 335; and simple life, 346, 351; springs in, 337–8; townsmen in, 346
- Bupalus, 462
- Byzantium, 20–1
- Cadmean letters, 51
- caesura, 179–80
- Caligula, 158–9; *see also* Philip, dates
- Callicrates of Samos, 278–85, 294 n. 66
- Callicter, 359
- “Callimacheanism,” 377, 379; in Catullus, 545
- Callimachus, 74, 78–83, 96, 148, 152, 165–6, 168, 170–1, 178, 191, 198–205, 276–7, 282, 286, 288, 290–2, 315, 321–6, 327, 329, 387–8, 389–90, 392–3, 397–8, 402 n. 42, 404–7; dates, 147; relationship of with Ptolemies, 153; poem of on death of Heraclitus, 166, 169; character of epigrams in, 166; rare words in, 166; metrics, 181; length of epigrams in, 106–10; *Pinakes*, 131, 477, 479; *Aetia*, 131, 138,

- 165–6, 169, 171; *Iambi*, 131, 471–2, 478 n. 6; and preneoteric epigram, 533–4; and Catullus, 535–6, 539, 547; and theater, 477–87, 495; and ideal brevity, 486–7; theater production of, 485–6; use of in skoptic epigram, 366–9; use of philosophy in, 503–9, 511–2
- Callinus, 98
- Calpurnius Piso, 514
- Cameron, Alan, 141, 154
- Camillus, 159, 161
- canon, 429–31
- Canopus, 282 n. 25
- Cape Zephyrium, 278–86
- Carales, 175
- Casmylus, 301–2
- Catalepton*, 540
- Catullus, C. Valerius, 92, 313–4, 323, 448 n. 88, 545, 551, 568, 570–2; and term epigram, 534–41, 545–50; epigram as an “open form” in, 537; *Liber Catulli*, 537–8; linguistic registers in, 539–40; *venustus* as literary ideal of, 535–6
- Celtis, Konrad, 579
- Cephalas, Constantine, 20–2; arrangement of epigrams by, 154, 156–7; sources in, 154; reworking of Meleagrian sequences by, 158; reworking of Philippan sequences by, 162–3; work of discernible in *AP* 9, 251, as source on skoptic epigram, 353, 356–7; inclusions of in *AP* 11, 359
- Cerberus, 465–6
- Chaeremon, 153
- Chalcidians, 51, 62
- characterization, 233–49; definition of, 233–6; in amatory epigrams, 245–8; in dedicatory epigrams, 236–40; in epigrams on painting and sculpture, 243–5; in funerary epigrams, 240–3; typical, 235–42; unprecedented interest in in Hellenistic epigram, 236, 248
- Chares, 47
- Charon, 498
- Chénier, André, 574, 582
- Chesterfield, fourth earl of, 572
- childlikeness, dimension of Callimachus’ and Asclepiades’ epigrams on the theatre, 478–82
- Choerilus, 149
- choliambic meter, 98, 461; *see also* metrics
- Chrysogona, 291
- Cicero, 82, 549, 551; and Scaevola, 160
- Cimon, 59
- Cladus, 86, 88
- classicism, 493–4 n. 35
- Claudius, 159
- Cleinias, 282
- Cleobulus of Lindus, 60
- Cleombrotus of Ambracia, 80–3, 505
- Clytemnestra, 212
- Codex Palatinus, *see Palatine Anthology*
- collections, 89, 110–1, 131–46, 187, 229; and anthologies, 131–2, 136, 149–51; of epigrams, 76, 88–9; titles of, 114–7, 125–6, 132–3, 153; and physical juxtaposition of related poems in, 149; physical and editorial arrangement of, 135–40; and editor-poets of, 149; editors of, 150; *concordia*, or unity, as editorial principle in, 138–9; title of, 114–7, 125–6, 132–3, 153; *see also* anthology; epigram, inscriptional; epigram, literary; *Garland* of Meleager; *Garland* of Philip; *Soros*; and *Sylloge Simonidea*
- Colossus of Memnon, 545; graffiti at, 555–60
- comedy, 82, 172
- “comic witness,” 480–1
- communication system in epigram, patronage as, 275–94
- companion epigrams, 79–80, 221–2, 330–1; as characteristic of skoptic epigram, 363–4
- comparison, between deceased and citizens (or enemies), 529; between men and gods, 533
- conceit, *see argutia*
- concision, 169
- consolation, 78
- Cornarius, Janus, 565
- Cornelius Ariston, 302 n. 20
- Cornelius Gallus, C., 537
- Cornelius Scipio Africanus maior, P., 526–9
- Cornelius Scipio Barbatus, L. 521–3
- Cornelius Scipio, L. iunior, 521–3
- Cornelius Sulla, L., 527, 532
- coronis*, 140, 154
- Costanzi, Antonio, 575
- court, and epigram, 153, 161, 164, 538;

- and poetry, 275–94; ideology, 276–7, 288, 290–1; and propaganda, 289, 291, 538; queens, 275–94; sibling love, sibling marriage, 291; of archaic tyrants, 455; *see also* Antigonids, Attalids, Ptolemies
- Cowper, William, 582
- Cratinus, 477 n. 2, 478
- Creophylus, epigrams on, 189, 478
- Cretan, 75–6, 198–9; Crete, 75
- Crinagoras, 160–1, 173, 175, 201, 293; dates, 160; Doric epigrams of, 178; metrics, 182
- Critias, 97; son of Hippacus and Didyme from Cyzicus), 288
- Ctesibius, 284
- culture of reading, 187; *see also* culture of reception, culture of viewing
- culture of reception, 207
- culture of viewing, 252–3; *see also* ecphrasis, epigram, ecphrastic
- Cybele, 91
- cycles, of epigrams, 326–7, 331–2; *see also* anthology, collections
- Cynics and Cynicism, 346, 497–9, 509–12; in Meleager, 151; *see also* Diogenes of Sinope, Hipparchia, Leonidas of Tarentum
- Cynisca, 296
- Cyniscus, 297–8
- Cyrene, 78, 290 n. 54, 291–2
- Cyrnus, 100, 102, 105, 110
- dactyls, 96; *see also* metrics
- Daedalus, 266
- Damagetus, 148, 152; dates, 147
- Daphnis, 89, 347–50
- death, 336, 339, 343, 345, 349, 350–1; circumstances of, 71–72, 87; of Ptolemaic prince, 425–6
- dedications, 33–7, 42–6, 59, 173, 178, 341–2, 347; objects in, 74, 83–4; *see also* epigram, dedicatory
- dedicatory epigram, *see* epigram, dedicatory
- Déheque, Frédéric, 574
- deictics, deixis, 8, 31–2, 37–8, 45, 63; in literary epigram, 253, 255; *see also* τόδε
- deification, 278–88, 528–9
- Delian epigram, 65
- Delos, inscribed epigram at, 8–11, 65; inscriptions at, 2, 15, 53, 121
- Demeter, 230–1
- Demetrius, *On Style*, 319–21
- Demosthenes, 58–9; source of epigrams in, 58
- Depew, Mary, 41
- descriptive epigram, 337; *see also* ecphrasis; epigram, ecphrastic
- destruction of Troy and Mycene, 419–22
- dialect, 177–8, 456
- dialogue, 72, 84, 87, 194, 203–4; in epigram, 72, 87–8, 192, 196–7, 202–4; form and ecphrastic epigram, 252
- diatribe, 510–1
- didaskaliai*, arrangement of, 479
- Didot papyrus, 280 n. 18, 282; *see also* P.Louvre 7172
- Diocles, dedicatee of Meleager's *Garland*, 152
- Diocles, poet of Philip's *Garland*, dates, 160
- Diodorus Cronus, 504–5
- Diodorus of Sardis, 160–1; dates, 160
- Diogenes Laertius, 60, 500–1
- Diogenes of Sinope, 497–8
- Diomedes, 303–4
- Dionysius Chalcus, 97
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 54
- Dionysius of Heracleia, 502
- Dionysus, 82, 482–6
- Diophon, 300–1
- Dioscorides, 148, 152, 172; dates, 147; metrics, 181; and theater, 487–95; as emulator of Sappho, 450
- Diotimus, 152
- Dipylon wine jug, 35–6
- direct speech, 77
- Doolittle, Hilda, 583
- Dorat, Jean, 577
- Doricha, 447, 452
- drama and epigram, 409
- Du Bellay, Joachim, 568, 576
- Duke of the Palatinate, 20
- dynasty, 276, 278, 286, 288, 290; *see also* Antigonids, Attalids, court, Ptolemies
- Echo/echo, 89, 195–6; *see also* voice
- ecphrasis, 29, 32–3, 69, 171–2, 189, 206, 432, 434
- editions of *GA*, 565, 574, 578; editio princeps, 565; selected, 565, 575; *see also* Bosch, Hieronymus de; Brunck, Richard; Cornarius, Janus; Jacobs, Friedrich; Lascaris, Janus;

- Mackail, J. W.; Manutius, Aldus;
Soter, Joannes
- effects/efficacy (aesthetic, religious,
social; of reading and viewing),
32–3, 35, 40–2, 46; *see also* emotional
heightening, framing, performance,
reading, reception, (re)enactment,
response, social negotiation
- Egypt, Egyptian, 276, 284–5, 288, 447
- Eion epigrams, 58
- elegiac couplet, 96–7, 179; in papyrus
columns, 135–6; technique of, 537;
see also epigram, inscriptional
- elegy, 70; and epigram, 535–7;
influence on epigram, 95–112; length
of poems, 104–8; visual similarity
of to epigram, 314; excerpted, 117;
Latin, 91, 557–8
- elogium*, 521–6; as epigram, 521–3;
reception of, 525–6, 527, 529
- emblem, genre of, in relation to
epigram, 570
- emotional heightening, 31, 39–41, 43,
46; *see also* ἄγαλμα, artistry, χαίρω/
χάρις, effects/efficacy, performance,
response
- Empedocles, 503
- enargeia* (“vividness”), 252, 319
- encomiastic style, 10; and epigram, 533;
see also 275–94
- England, influence of Greek epigram
in, 568, 570–2, 574, 578–9, 581–3;
see also Chesterfield, fourth earl of;
Cowper, William; Doolittle, Hilda;
Gray, Thomas; Harington, John;
Harrison, Tony; Herrick, Robert;
Johnson, Samuel; Jonson, Ben;
Kendall, Timothy; Landor, Walter
Savage; Lily, William; Mackail, J. W.;
More, Thomas; Owen, John; Philips,
Edward; Prior, Matthew; Shakespeare,
William; Shelley, Percy Bysshe; Sidney,
Philip; Symonds, John Addington;
Turberville, George; Whigham, Peter;
Wilson, John; Wyatt, Thomas; *see also*
Scotland, translations into English
- Ennius, 544–5
- Epeius, 417–8, 422
- epic, in epigram, 373–90, 409–28;
patterns, 425–6; coloring; *see also*
Homer
- Epicharmus, 478 n. 2
- Epicureanism, 508–9, 512–7
- epideictic epigram, 29, 69, 90, 146
n. 56, 153, 161, 163, 176, 178; and
ecphrastic, 251 (*see also* epigram,
ecphrastic); rhetorical stamp of, 251
- epigram/*epigramma*, and textuality, 7;
and emulation, 7; and transition from
stone to book, 7; and elegy, 11–2,
38, 95–112; payment for, 16;
transmission of, 17–24; theory of,
188; genre of as brief instance of
larger forms, 567, 569; categorized
in Renaissance by kind of oratory,
567; oralistic conventions of, 202;
passer-by, 72, 79–80, 88, 90, 92, 136,
191, 193–4, 204, 206, 218, 222, 224;
allocution to, 524; gnomai in, 71, 77;
books and collections, 314, 375–6
(*see also* anthologies); and
improvisation, 12, 540; *epigramma*,
114, 118, 125–7, 132 n. 13, 133;
meaning of in Herodotus, 51, 53;
meaning of in Thucydides, 55;
meaning of in orators, 59; expansion
of meaning beginning in fourth
century, 59; in Plato, 64; in Cicero,
545; as “open” form, 537
- epigram, dedicatory, 69, 83–5, 153, 161,
163, 172, 176, 178, 199–200, 204,
217–8, 253, 278–86, 336, 341, 347;
characterization in, 236–40; and
philosophy, 499; formulae in, 83–4,
217; *Anathematika* in P.Mil.Vogl. VIII
309, 142–3, 145, 157, 286
- epigram, ecphrastic, 69, 189, 223–5,
251–271, 286–7, 416–8;
characterization in, 243–5; and
epideictic, 251; characteristics and
tendencies of, 251–60; not full
epideixis, 251; anachronistic term,
252; subject of, work of art, 252; as
source for study of art, 252, 266;
name of artist in, 252; and act of
viewing, 252–3; instruction in, 252;
role of imagination in, 253; illusion,
254, 259; role of exegete in, 253,
257, 259; “Pictures at an Exhibition,”
258; subject of, interpretation, 253;
symbols, interpretation of in, 207–8,
253, 260–3; praise of artists in,
254; *paragone*, sister arts in, 254,
268–71; by Erinna, 255–6; by Nossis,
256–7; by Posidippus, 257–60; *topoi*
in, 257–8; sequences of, 263–9; by
Leonidas and Theocritus, 263–5; by
Leonidas, 267–8; by Philip, 268–9;

- on Anacreon, 263–5; on Niobe and Medea, 265; on Myron's *Cow*, 265–9; as vehicle for Hellenistic poetics, 268; *topoi* in, 270–1; *Andriantopoiika* in P.Mil. Vogl. VIII 309, 142, 258, 286 n. 40; *Lithika* in P.Mil. Vogl. VIII 309, 142, 144–5, 153, 170, 258, 285, 287 n. 44, 293 n. 65
- epigram, epinician, definition of, 275, 278, 295, 310–1; deictic reference in, 298, 299, 302–3; sophistication of, 299–302, 312, 298 n. 10; anti-climactic, 307; dialogue 301, 305; erotic 311–2; mock, 308, 311; mythological, 303; paradoxical, 306; satirical parody in, 308, 311–2; authentic inscriptions, 295–8, 302–3; fictitious/literary 299–302, 303–10; synagonistes, 309; *Hippika* in P.Mil. Vogl. VIII 309, 142, 144, 153, 258, 286, 290–1
- epigram, erotic, 95, 153, 156–7, 163, 176, 205, 288 n. 45, 313–32; and Meleager, 153, 156–7, 174; and Philip, 161; characterization in, 245–8; origin of, 314, apple as love-token in, 201, 209; sexual preference, literary debates about in, 384–9; pederastic epigram, 154, 574; pederasty absent in Philip's *Garland*, 161; homoerotic, 157, 179, 452
- epigram, Greek, contrasted with Latin, 570–2; and emblem, 570; in ancient Latin translation or imitation, 566; influence since Renaissance, 566–583 (*see also* England, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Russia, Scotland, Spain, and United States); and madrigal, 569; as insipid, 571–2; quoted by ancient Greek writers, 566; quoted by modern writers, 566; as simple, 573–4; and sonnet, 569; written by modern scholars, 566; *see also* epigram; epigram, inscriptional; epigram, literary; translations of Greek epigram
- epigram, Hellenistic, length of, 106–10; search for definition of identity for, 168; traditionalism in, 168; in third century, 171; *see also* epigram, literary
- epigram, inscriptional, in general, 17–9, 29–47, 49–69, 168, 174–5; dedicatory, 1–2, 34, 59, 83–4, 114 (*see also* separate listings dedications; epigram, dedicatory); honorific, 1–2; agonistic, 114; sepulchral, 1–2, 38–40, 114, 191–2; (*see also* separate listing epigram, sepulchral); and hexameter, 1, 51; and elegiac couplet, 51; as percentage of all inscriptions, 2–4; and aristocrats, 3, 46–7, 66; anonymity of poet in, 4, 55, 89, 198; in fourth century, 4; and literary epigram, 5, 69–93, 168 (*see also* separate listing epigram, literary); imitated by literary epigram, 252–3; distinction from literary, 73, 83; gathered into books, 5–6, 25–6, 49–50, 58; and literary addenda, 60; republication of, 52; cited by authors, 8, 49–68; and decontextualization, 67; Homeric resonances in, 9–11; meter, 19; editions of, 17–9; as poems, 29–32, 35; function of, 30; formulae in, 30–1, 34–6, 70–3; and poetic quality, 30–2, 34; performance of, 32, 38; and objects, 32, 37, 49; and guidance of viewing, 33–4; social efficacy of, 35; as occasional genre, 35, 49; as shapers of events, 49; oral dissemination of, 49, 54, 65–6; literary dissemination of, 49–68; system of references in, 50; recontextualization of, 52, 62, 69–70, 134, 136, 143; “mini-collections” of, 56–7; as παραδείγματα, 66; ascribed to Simonides, 113–30; style in, 174–5; use by modern scholars, 188; act of reading in, 191–4; layout of, 525; characteristics of, 70; incompleteness of, 78; formulae in, 74; and voice, 77; and context, 48–50; and *Ergänzungsspiel*, 50, 56, 62; erasure of, 54; and condition of the letters, 54; referred to as ἐλεγείον, 55; and the temple of Ismenian Apollo at Thebes, 51, 56; and the Delphic Amphictyony, 53, 57; and orators 58–9; and propaganda, 58–9; and *technē*, 61, 64; and professionalization in fifth century B.C., 64, 67; and literary pretension of, 64
- epigram, literary, 6–16, 70, 85, 447; emulation of inscribed epigram by, 8, 70, 80, 168; collection of in books,

- 8, 133–4; 149–51; occasionality of, 12, 161; transmission of, 20–4; editions of, 22–4; influence of on inscribed epigram, 85–93; surplus of information in, 304; as surplus information in as literary indicator, 77, 83, 85; technical terms in, 172–3; second-century crisis in, 147–9; character of in poets of Philip's *Garland*, 161; innovations in, 168–9; decline in, in Roman period, 545–6; *see also* epigram, Hellenistic
- epigram, Roman, 91–3, 521–63; social status of, 521, 524–6, 535, 540
- epigram, sepulchral, 69–71, 73–83, 85–90, 153, 156, 161, 163, 170, 176, 191–3, 198, 202–3, 206, 253, 288–92, 336, 340, 349, 432, 434, 445–6, 452; inscriptional, 70–3; inscriptional influences of on literary, 73–83; characterization in, 240–3; praise of deceased, 71, 218; self-epitaph, 529–30; for mythical heroes, 412–6; for philosophers, 497–9; for women, 70–1; bride/corpses in, 220–3, 225, 229; on shipwrecked sailors, 242–3; *Nauagika* in P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309, 142; *see also* epitaph, *Epitymbia*
- epigram, sympotic, 12–4, 119, 288 n. 45; and skoptic, 356–61; and performance, 13–4; sympotic poetry, 455; *see also* symposium, sympotic themes
- epigram criticism, since Renaissance, 567–74; style, *argutia* (wit, point, conceit), 570–2; Catullus vs. Martial, 568, 571; Greek vs. Latin, 571–2; *mel* vs. *sal*, 568, 571; simple vs. compound, 573
- epigrammatic “I,” *see* speaker
- epinician odes, Pindar's, 298, 300–2, 311; *see also* epigram, epinician
- epistolary epigram, 201–2
- epitaphs, 38, 77–8, 173–4, 207; fictional, 124; women in, 217–8; tombstone, 459; *see also* epigram, sepulchral, *Epitymbia*
- epithet, 171–2, 174; use of in Philip, 177
- Epitymbia*, 142–5, 363; *see also* epigram, sepulchral; epitaphs; P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309
- epyllion*, 546
- Erastriatus, 309–10 n. 37
- Erasmus, Desiderius, 566, 578
- Eratosthenes, 131
- Ergänzungsspiel*, 8, 17, 50, 56, 62, 67, 209, 321, 393 n. 9, 400 n. 36; *see also* supplementation
- Erinna, 152, 197–8, 375–81, 478; dates, 147; and the female voice, 213–25; *Distaff*, 213–6, 218, 220, 223; *Distaff* of as work song, 216; *Distaff* of as Homeric *goos*, 213; regarded as equal of Homer, 216; and first “ecphrastic” epigram, 255–6; and *Aidōs/aidōs*, 214–6, 223; and Aphrodite, 214; and Baucis, 213–223, 225 (*see also Distaff*); epigrams of, 217–25; Baucis epigrams of as companion pieces, 221–3; gender-switching as a theme in, 224–5; self-consciousness of female voice in, 213, 217–8, 221; transgendered poetics of 215–6, 221, 225; visual art vs. poetry in, 223–5
- Eros, 329–30, 433, 438, 442, 449–50, 454, 456; in Anacreon and Hellenistic epigram, 456; *see also* epigram, erotic, ἔρως
- erotic epigram, *see* epigram, erotic
- Erucius, 160–1; dates, 160; metrics, 182
- Estienne, Henri, 565, 577
- Etearchus, 278 n. 14
- Eudoxus, 167
- Euenus, elegiac poet, 96–7, 102–3, 105, 108, 110–1
- Euenus, epigrammatist, 160
- Euhemerism, 529
- Euphemus, 152
- Euphorion, 152, 166–7; dates, 147; relationship of with Seleucids, 153
- Euripides, 64, 82
- facta*, in Latin epigram, 523, 529
- female genres, 211–2, 216
- female poets, 153, 211–31; *see also* listings of individual female poets' names
- fescennina iocatio*, 538
- fiction/fictitiousness, 188–92, 195–6, 199–200, 202, 204, 206–7, 209
- fishermen, 172; funerary epigrams on, 242
- Fitts, Dudley, 583
- focalization, 68, 211–3; female, in Erinna, 214; female, in Anyte, 229, 231

- forgeries, of classical and archaic epigrammatists, 375
 Forster, E. M., 323
 framing, 33, 35, 37–8, 41–3, 45–7;
 see also performance, reading,
 (re)enactment, thematization
 France, influence of Greek epigram
 in, 568–9, 571–3, 574, 577, 580–2;
 see also Boileau-Despréaux, Nicolas;
 Baïf, Jean-Antoine de; Bouhours,
 Dominique; Bourbon, Nicolas;
 Chénier, André; Déhèque, Frédéric;
 Dorat, Jean; Du Bellay, Joachim;
 Estienne, Henri; Marot, Clément;
 Gournay, Marie de; La Fontaine,
 Jean de; Malherbe, François de;
 Montaigne, Michel de; Montesquieu,
 baron de; Racan, Honorat de;
 Ronsard, Pierre de; Sainte-Beuve,
 Charles-Augustin; de Scève,
 Maurice; Sebillet, Thomas; Voltaire;
 translations into French
 Friedländer, Paul, and Hoffleit, Herbert,
 19
 funerary epigram, *see* epitaphs; *Epitymbia*;
 epigram, sepulchral
 Gaetulicus, 159; dates, 161
 gallery, as epigrammatic scene, 258–9
 Ganymede, 424
 gaping, *see* χάσκειν
 Garland of Meleager, 12, 16, 21–3, 55,
 73, 113, 126, 128, 140, 147, 149–50,
 170, 277, 375, 447; dating of, 152;
 proem of, 152, 175, 177; apparent
 random order of poets in proem,
 152–3; sequence in *AP* 6, 157–8;
 sequences in *AP* 7, 142; poets in
 Garland, 147–8, 152–3; epigrammatic
 subgenera in, 153; reconstruction of,
 154–6; closing poem of, 154; length
 of, 155; abridged versions of, 155;
 organizing principles of, 156–8; books
 of, 157; heterosexual and homosexual
 epigrams grouped together in, 157;
 subject-matter and lexical affinity as
 principle of arrangement in, 158;
 subtlety of arrangement of, 163;
 stylistics of poets in, 169–74; and
 Roman culture, 545; and preneoteric
 epigram, 532–4; and Catullus, 535–8,
 540–1
 Garland of Philip, 5, 16, 21–2, 24,
 73, 140, 277, 292–3; as source
 in Cephalas, 154; alphabetic
 arrangement of, 140, 156, 162–3;
 chronology of, 158, 160; poets of,
 159–61; proem of, 159–62, 176–8;
 character of poetry in, 161;
 reconstruction of, 161–3; preserved
 series of in *AP*, 162; length of, 162;
 school practice as inspiration of
 arrangement in, 163; stylistics of
 poets in, 175–9
 gaze, erotic, in Anacreon, 456 n. 12
 Geffcken, Johannes, 19
 Geminus, 160–1, 270–1; dates, 160
 gender, 277, 281–4, 287–91; male, 211
 gendered misreading, 222
 gendered poetics, archaic and classical
 periods, 211–2; Hellenistic period,
 212–3, 220–3, 225, 229–30; and
 public vs. private performance, 211–2
 gendered voice, 211–31
 genre, 275–6, 279, 285–6, 288; of
 inscribed epigram, 37, 42; and
 ecphrastic epigram, 252; ambiguity
 of, 252–3
 Germany, influence of Greek
 epigram in, 573–4, 579, 581–2;
 see also Celtis, Konrad; Goethe,
 Johann Wolfgang von; Herder,
 Johann Gottfried; Lessing, Gotthold
 Ephraim; Melanchthon, Philip; Opitz,
 Martin; and translations into German
 Giseke's Law, 180; *see also* metrics
 Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von, 582
 goos, 213–4, 216, 229
 Gournay, Marie de, 571–2
 Gow, A. S. F., xi, 23–4
 Gracián, Baltazar, 571
 grammar, 197; 224–5; ambiguity of,
 255–6; *see also* act of writing
 grave markers, 34, 169; *see also* epitaph,
 Epitymbia, epigram, sepulchral
 graphein, 197, 225; in ecphrastic epigram,
 257; *see also* author and writer
 Gray, Thomas, 578
 Greek Anthology (*GA*), 20, 113, 115, 117,
 121, 146, 187; arrangement of, 21–2
 Greek epigram, *see* epigram, Greek
 griphos, *see* riddle
 Grotius, Hugo, 578
 Guarino da Verona, 575
 Gutzwiller, Kathryn, 24, 136, 206, 213
 habrosyne, 448
 Hades, 80, 82–3, 220–2, 230, 418

- Hadrian, 359, 545, 550; epigram by, 553–4
- Halicarnassus, 64, 86; inscriptional epigram at, 175
- Hansen, Peter Allan, 18
- hapax legomenon*, 173, 391–406; in Meleager, 174
- Harington, John, 568
- Harrison, Tony, 583
- Hecataeus, poet, 10
- Hecataeus, statue of Philitas by, 243–4; and Lysippus, 259
- Hector, 415, 423, 426
- Hecuba, 424
- Hedylus, 12–13, 148, 358–9; dates, 147; length of epigrams in, 106–10; relationship of with Ptolemies, 153
- Hegesippus, 152; dates, 147; on P.Köln V 204, 149–50
- Helen, 214
- Helicon, 464
- Hellanicus, 55
- Hellenistic epigram, *see* epigram, Hellenistic
- Hellenistic poets, unexpected meters in, 97; and the past, 187; refashioning of ancient poetry, 112; metrical novelties, 179; and enactment, 187; interest of in others' *oeuvre*, 187; self-consciousness of, 190
- Hellenistic scholarship, 131–46, 187; use of in epigram, 391–428; *grammatikoi*, 367
- hendecasyllabi*, 540
- Hephaestus, 266
- Heracles, 82, 167, 341
- Heraclitus, 126 n. 11, 205–6, 503
- Hercules, 307
- Herder, Johann Gottfried, 573–4, 582
- Hermann's Bridge, 180–2; *see also* metrics
- Hermes, 86–8, 192, 305, 337–8, 340–1
- Hermesianax, 98, 110, 131, 138
- Hermias, tyrant of Atarneus, 500
- Hermippus, 96, 131
- Hermodorus, 148 n.3, 152
- Herodes Agrippa, 158
- Herodotus, 50–3, 55–7, 64, 67, 122; and inscriptions, 50, 122–3; sources of for inscriptions, 51–2; and epigrams, 51; and ancient authors, 52; and Simonides, 53; and “mini-collections”, 56–7; and Cadmean letters, 51
- heroization, *see* *deification*
- Herrick, Robert, 582
- hetaerae, dedications by, 237–8, 239–40
- hiatus, in Catullus, 537 n. 69
- hic est situs*, 527, 531
- Hieron II of Syracuse, 16
- Hilberg's Law, 180; *see also* metrics
- Hipparchia, 174, 498
- Hipparchus, 60, 63–5
- Hippias, 53
- Hippika*, *see* epigram, epinician; P.Mil. Vogl. VIII 309
- Hipponax, 96, 98, 459–76; as wasp, 467; and Catullus, 538
- Homer, 55, 59, 87, 118, 178, 219, 430, 432 n. 13, 435, 441, 454 n. 114, 459; and epigram, 409–28; as model for epigrammatic allusion, 373, 377–9, 380, 382; *Odyssey*, 502, 514; glosses of in epigram, 391–408
- homoerotic epigram, *see* epigram, erotic
- Honestus, dates, 160
- Horace, 139, 452, 560
- Hungary, influence of Greek epigram in, 575
- Hunter, Richard, 169, 206
- Hyginus, 220
- hypotext, Homer as, 301, 303–4; Pindar as, 298, 300–2, 311
- iambic trimeter, 96, 136, 179; *see also* metrics
- iambographer, 431 n. 11, 433, 463; aggressive voice of, 475; self-righteous stance of, 463, 468–9, 473, 475; and mockery, 460–1; targets of, 464
- iambus*, 96–7, 460, 463
- Ibycus, 429–30, 432–5, 478 n. 3
- Ich-rede*, 32, 38
- Idomeneus, 416–7
- imitatio*/imitation, 148–50, 153, 254, 359; *see also* *aemulatio*, *variatio*
- impliziter Leser*, 191, 209
- indeterminacy/*Unbestimmtheit*, 209
- inscriptional epigrams, *see* epigram, inscriptional
- inscriptions, 188, 190–2, 197–8, 206; archaic, 72, 83; multiple, 79; in Hellenistic age, 1; laws, decrees, accounts not metrical, 2; laws and official edicts, 69; Herodotus' paraphrases of, 51
- inspiration, poetic, 446

- intermediality/transgression between genres and media, 189, 199
 interpretation, 169, 174, 190; and ecphrastic epigram, 252; allegorical, 261
 intertextuality, 219–21, 230–1
 intratextuality, 363–4
inutilis; see χρηστός
 invitation poem, 514–5
 Ion of Samos, 4–6, 13, 116 n. 13
 Iser, Wolfgang, 188, 191
 Isocrates, 58
 Italy, influence of Greek epigram in
 567, 569, 570–1, 575–7, 580, 581, 583; see also Alamanni, Luigi; Alciato, Andrea; Angeriano, Girolamo; Costanzi, Antonio; Guarino da Verona; Marino, Giovanbattista; Marullo, Michele; Medici, Lorenzo, de'; Minturno, Antonio; Navagero, Andrea; Pigna, Giovan; Poliziano, Angelo; Quasimodo, Salvatore; Robertello, Francesco; Scaliger, Julius Caesar; Tasso, Torquato; Tolomei, Claudio
 Iulis (Ceos), 282, 285 n. 34
 ivy crowns and the theater, 484–5

 Jacobs, Friedrich, 23, 565
 Janus Secundus, 577
 Johnson, Samuel, 578
 joke, 114, 209; as characteristic of *AP* 11, 361–2
 Jonson, Ben, 568
 Julia Balbilla, 555–60

 Kaibel, Georg, 19
 Kairos, epigram on, 260–2
 Kendall, Timothy, 581
 Ker, 31, 62
 kings, 275–94; see also Antigonids, Attalids, court, Ptolemies, Roman emperors
 kisses, theme of, 535
klea gunaikōn, 220
kleos, 219–20; poetic glory, 421, 432, 439, 440 n.53
 knowledge/epistemology, 200–2, 208
 Kochanowski, Jan, 581

 La Fontaine, Jean de, 582
 lament, 222, 229; see also *goos*
 lamp, 319–20
 Landor, Walter Savage, 579, 582

 Lascaris, Janus (Giovanni), 22, 565
laudatio funebris, 523–4
 León, Luis de, 581
 Leonidas of Tarentum, 74–6, 87–9, 148, 150, 152, 172–3, 179, 207; dates, 147, 172; relationship of with Pyrrhus king of Epirus, 153; style in, 172–3; influence of on Philippan poets, 176, 179; metrics, 181; ecphrastic epigram of, 263–4; use of philosophy in, 498–500, 509–12; baroque style of, 340; artificiality in, 341
 Leonides, 552
leptos, 364, 368
 Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim, 573
 Lily, William, 578
 literacy and orality, 14
 literary epigram; see epigram, literary
Lithika, see epigram, ecphrastic; P.Mil. Vogl. VIII 309
locus amoenus, 335, 337, 348
longum, epigramma, 540
 Lope de Vega, 581
 love, 333, 347–9; marital, 282, 290–1; as madness, 451; as sickness, cures for, 388–9; see also epigram, erotic; ἔρως; sibling love
 lower classes, 172, 174, 339–42
 Lucianus, 195
 Lucilius, C., 530–1
 Lucilius, 179, 198, 355, 359, 367
ludicra, 540
 Lutatius Catulus, Q. senior, 531–5, 545
 Lycambes, 462; daughters of, 462, 465, 472–74, 476
 Lycon of Scarphea, 477 n. 2
 lying, 267; see also ψεύδος and ἀπάτη
 lyric poetry, as song, 447; distich structure of some, 455
 lyric poets, and epigram, 429–57, 478; epigrams ascribed to, 447; see also Alcaeus, lyric poet; Anacreon; Bacchylides; Ibycus; Pindar; Sappho; Simonides
 Lysias, 58, 60–1, 64
 Lysippus, 144, 252, 258–9; school of, 259; statue of Kairos by, 260–2; statue of Alexander by, 243

 Macedonia, Macedonian, 275, 282–5
 Macedonius, dates, 160
 Machon, 494–5
 Mackail, J. W., 574

- madrigal, 569
 Maecenas, 294 n. 66
 Magas of Cyrene, 290 n. 54
 male genres, 212; *see also* masculine voice, masculinity
 Malherbe, François de, 572
 Mandrocles, 51, 53, 56
 Manuzio, Aldo, 22, 565
 Marcus Argentarius, 384–90; dates, 160; metrics, 182
 Mark Anthony, 158
 Marot, Clément, 568, 580
 Martial, 92, 568, 570, 571, 572;
 reception of Greek epigram, 561–3;
 as contaminator of Greek epigram, 545–6; influence on, by Lucilius and Nicarchus, 355
 Marullo, Michele, 575
 masculine voice, 219, 226–9, 231;
 see also male genres
 masculinity, 211, 226–9, 231
 Maximus Planudes, 20
 Medea, 212
 Medeios of Olynthus, 170, 278 n. 14
 Medici, Lorenzo de', 569, 570
 Megistias, 53, 56–7, 122, 124
 Melanchthon, Philip, 579
 Melanippides, 152
 Meleager, 55, 86, 89, 92, 115, 117, 121, 126, 147, 174, 177, 181–2, 207, 315, 316, 326–32; as anthologist, 149; biography and works, 151–2; self-epitaphs, 152; metrics, 181; epigrams on, 189; as emulator of Sappho, 449; *see also* Garland of Meleager
 Menecrates, 152
 Menedemus, 502–3
 Menestheus, 59
 Menophila, 262
 Merkelbach, Reinhold, and Stauber, Josef, 18
 metaphor, poetological, 208; epinician, 310–1
 metrics, 120–1, 139, 179–83; in
 Meleagrian and Philippan poets, 179; statistics on for Meleagrian poets, 181–2; statistics on for Philippan poets, 182–3; and papyrus columns, 135; inner metric, 179–80, 183; outer metric, 179; “laws” of, 180; Naeke’s Law, 119; elision at bucolic diaeresis, 120–1; scansion in Trajan, 550, 552
 Midas epigram, 50, 60, 62–4, 67
 Milan Posidippus, *see* Posidippus, P.Mil. Vogl. VIII 309
 Miletus, 79; sacred law of, 47
 mime, in epigram, 247, 329
 Mimnermus, 98, 110–1
 “minor heroes,” 416, 418
 Minos, 76
 Minturno, Antonio, 569
mise en scène, 194, 200, 252
 Mnasalces, 132, 148, 152, 167; dates, 147; on P.Köln V 204, 149–50
 Moero, 152; dates, 147
 Montaigne, Michel de, 571
 Montesquieu, Charles de, 572
 monument, 29–9, 77, 79, 84, 188, 193, 197–8, 207, 218, 308; “speaking,” 193, 195–6, 198–9; as site of social negotiation, 38; and epigram, 524–5
 More, Thomas, 578
 Mucius Scaevola, Q., 532
 Muses, 86, 88–9, 208, 216, 429, 433, 435–7, 441, 445, 516
 Museum at Alexandria, 132
 music, 335, 338–9, 349
 Myron, 144, 252, 298 n. 10, 312; epigrams on *Cow*, 265–9
 Naevius, Cn., 529–30
 Nanno, 98, 110
 narrative, in epigram, 422–5; silences in, 169
Nauagika, *see* epigram, sepulchral; P.Mil. Vogl. VIII 309
 Navagero, Andrea, 571, 576
 Nemean lion, 167
 Nero, 159, 552
 Netherlands, influence of Greek epigram in 577–8; *see also* Erasmus, Desiderius; Grotius, Hugo; Janus Secundus
 New Comedy, and characterization, 235, 239
 “New Simonides,” 122
 Nicaenetus of Samus, 152, 477 n. 2; dates, 147
 Nicagoras, in Asclepiades, Callimachus and Hedylus, 236–7, 246
 Nicander, 131; relationship of with Attalids, 153
 Nicarchus, 355, 359, 550
 Nicias, 152; dates, 147
 nobility, 288–94; *see also* upper classes
 Nossis, 148, 152, 167, 226–9, 269, 477 n. 2, 494 n. 36; and the female voice,

- 226–9; dates, 147; dialogue of with Archilochus fr. 5 W, 227–8; gender switch in, 229; and heroic code, 227–8; idiosyncratic perspective of in male voiced epigrams, 226–7; influence of Erinna on, 226, 229; impersonation of male voice in, 227–9; ecphrastic epigram of, 256–7; reconstructable poetry book of, 256; as tour guide in ecphrastic epigram, 256; imitation of Asclepiades by, 450; use of Sappho as model in, 445–6
nugae see *polymetric*
- obscenity, 460, 462, 538–9
occentatio, 538
 Odysseus, 219–220, 418
 Olympia, 275, 286
 Omphale, 307
 Opitz, Martin, 573, 581
ops, 528
 orality, see literacy and orality
 orators, use of epigrams by, 58–9
 Orestes, and Euripides' *Orestes*, 485–6
 Orpheus, 478 n. 3
 Ovid, 92, 220 330; friend of Sabinus, 161
 Owen, John, 579
- P.Köln V 204, 149–50
 P.Louvre 7172, 25
 P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309, xi, 5–6, 10, 12, 25, 137, 141, 157; layout and organization of, 141–6; sections of, 142, 157; *Anathematika*, 142–3, 145, 157, 286; *Andriantopoiika*, 142, 258, 286 n. 40; *Hippika*, 142, 144, 153, 258, 286, 290–1; *Iamatika*, 71, 142, 145, 258; *Lithika*, 142, 144–5, 153, 170, 258, 285, 287 n. 44, 293 n. 65; *Nauagika*, 142; *Oionoskopika*, 142, 170, 284; *Tropoi*, 142; *Tropoi* and skoptic epigram, 362–3; definition of term, *Tropoi*, 363; subgenera within, 153; court-poetry within, 153; uneven style of, 170; dialect in, 177; epigrams on art within, 251, 257–60; and sub-genres, 360, 362; intratextuality in, 363; see also Posidippus
- P.Oxy. 2535, 53
 P.Oxy. 3324, 155
 P.Oxy. 662, 150
 P.Petrie II 49a, 25
 P.Petrie II 49b, 478
- P.Vindob. G 40611, 133
 Pacuvius, 529–30
paegnia, 540
 Page, D. L., xi, 23–4
 Palamedes, 422–3
Palatine Anthology (AP), 20–2, 140, 565–6; scholia and lemmata in, 152, 356–7; Meleagrian series within, 154–5; book 12, 154; lacuna in book 9 of, 155; epigrams on art transmitted in book 9 of, 251
pallor amantis, 539
 Pamphilus, 148 n.3, 152
 Pan, 89, 338, 348
 Pancrates, 152
 panegyric, 275, 288, 293
 Pannonius, Janus, 575
 Papinius, *epigrammation*, 540
 papyri, 131, 187; containing epigrams, 149–50; 155; see also individual papyri
paragraphos, 135, 141
paraklausithyron, 323–4
 Parmenion, dates, 160
partheneion, 220
 Parthenides, 152
 Parthenius of Nicaea, 161, 552
 pastoral epigrams; see bucolic
 patron/patronage, 201–2, 275–94, esp. 275–8, 284–5, 292–4; in Roman milieu, 526, 532, 540; patrician, 292–4
 Pausanias, geographer, 55, 121
 Pausanias, Spartan regent, 53–5, 121–2
 pederastic epigram/pederasty, see epigram, erotic
 Peek, Werner, 18–9
 Peisistratus, 53–5
 Pella, 277 n. 9, 289 n. 50
 performance, 14, 32–5, 37–8, 41, 46–7, 211–2; of elegy, 95–6; female public, 211; see also effects/efficacy; emotional heightening; epigram, inscriptional; epigram, literary; framing; reading; reception; (re)enactment; response; social negotiation; thematization; traditional referentiality
 Pergamum, 277 n. 9
 Periander, 285 n. 34
 Pericles, 310 n. 37
 Persephone, 220, 230; rape of, 220–2, 230
 Perses, 152; dates, 147
 Perseus, 306
 Persian Wars, impact on survival

- of inscriptions, 3, 52; impact on epigram, 7–8
 Phaedimus, 153; dates, 147
 Phaennus, 152
 Phalaecus, 477 n. 2
 Phalaecian verse, 540
 Phanius, 148, 153, 172, 533; dates, 147; as imitator of Leonidas, 148
phantasia, 269
 Pharos, 278, 280 n. 18, 281 n. 20, 282, 283 n. 28
 Pheidolas, 302–3
 Phidippides, 117
 Philetas of Samos, 77–9
 Philiadēs of Megara, 116 n. 13
 Philicus, 477 n. 2, 484 n. 18
 Philip V of Macedonia, 528
 Philip, dates; 158–9, 172, 176–7, 179; relationship of with emperor's court, 158; as *cliens*, 161; number of poems ascribed to, 161; evaluation of poetic talent of, 161; literary program of, 177; fondness of for epideictic, 162; Doric epigrams of, 178; metrics, 182; distaste of for Alexandrian poetry, 183; *see also* *Garland* of Philip
 Philippus, doctor, 278 n. 14
 Philippus, 298 n. 10
 Philips, Edward, 572
 Philitas of Cos, 10, 131, 144, 314, 393; relationship of with Ptolemies, 153; Hecataeus' statue of, 243–4, 258–9; as founder of Hellenistic avantgarde, 258; as innovator, 259–60; dates, 260; authority of, 260
 Philochorus, *Epigrammata Attika* of, 6, n. 26
 Philoctetes, 417
 Philodemus of Gadara, 161, 175–6, 201, 293; earliest poet excluded from Meleager's *Garland*, 152; oldest included in Philip's *Garland*, 160; dates, 152, 160; Doric epigrams of, 178; metrics, 182; on character, 234; and Roman culture, 544, 549–50; on characterization, 234–5; use of philosophy in, 512–7
 philology, Hellenistic, *see* Hellenistic scholarship; ancient Roman
 philosophers, use of epigram in, 59–67; poverty of in epigram, 511–2
 Pigna, Giovan, 569
pinax, 254, 257
 Pindar, 43, 208, 429–30, 435–8, 478 n. 3
 Piso Caesoninus, L. Calpurnius, patron of Philodemus, 293
 Piso Frugi, L. Calpurnius, patron of Antipater of Thessalonica, 293
 Pittacus of Mytilene, 506–7, 511
Planudean Anthology (APL), 20–2, 140, 565, 578; and *GA* 16, 22
 Plato, 50, 59–60, 62, 64, 66–7, 76, 80–2, 147, 153, 201, 267, 497, 500–1, 506; *Phaedo*, 80–3; *Lysis*, 102; and his sources for epigram, 59–60; and Midas epigram, 60–3; and Hipparchus, 63–4; use of epigram in, 59–65, 67
 Plautus, and Roman epigram, 529–31, 533–4, 539
 Plutarch, 98, 110
poematia, 540
 poetic "I," 223
 poetic program, *see* literary program
 poetic theory, 266; terminology of, 266
 poets, epigrams on dead, 459
 point, *see argutia*
 Poland, influence of Greek epigram in, 581; *see also* Kochanowski, Jan
 Polemon, 160–1; dates, 160
 Poliziano, Angelo, 566, 575
polyandron, 7, 72
 Polyclitus/Polycleitus, 144, 152, 258
 Polycrates of Samos, 285; ring of, 455 n. 119
 Polydeuces, 298 n. 10
 polymetric *nugae*, and epigram, 535, 537–8, 540
 Polyphemus, 418 n. 30, 427
 Polystratus, 152, 533; dates, 147
 Pomptilla, 175
poneros, 469–70
ponos-Konzept, 189, 202
 Porcius Licinus, 531, 534–5
 Poseidon, 145, 427
 Posidippus, 25, 89, 132, 146, 148; 153, 170–1, 177, 208, 269, 275–94, 314, 326, 329, 385, 391–3, 397–404, 407; dates, 147; testimonia, 15; relationship of with Ptolemies, 153, 170; length of epigrams in, 106–10; the "old Posidippus", 143; "Seal" of, 15–6, 171; metrics, 181; ecphrastic epigrams of, 257–60; scene in ecphrastic epigrams of, 258; epigram of on Kairos, 260–1; and Propertius, 550;

- use of philosophy in, 509; *see also*
 P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309
 potters, signatures of, 116
 Pound, Ezra, 583
 Pratinas of Phlius, 488–493
 Praxiteles, 252
 preneoteric epigram, 531–4; and
 Catullus, 535, 540
pretium, 528
 Priam, 415–6
 priamel, 450
 Prior, Matthew, 582
 Prometheus, 197, 225; as creator of
 humans, 223–4; as inventor of written
 poetry, 224; as artist, 266; *Prometheus*
 Bound, 224
propemptikon, 446
 Propertius, 74, 92, 330
 Protesilaus, 415
 Protis, 291
psychagogia, 267
 Ptolemaeus, 283 n. 28
 Ptolemies, Ptolemaic, 275–94; court,
 153
 Ptolemy Eupator, 288 n. 48
 Ptolemy I Soter, 290
 Ptolemy II Philadelphus, 170, 282,
 290–1
 Ptolemy III Euergetes, 278 n. 12, 290
 Ptolemy VI Philometor, 288 n. 48
 Pushkin, Aleksandr Sergeyevich, 582
 Puteoli, harbor mole at, 158–9
 puzzle epigrams, 253
 Pyrrho of Elis, 502, 507, 512
 Pythagoreanism, in Roman milieu, 529
 Pythian Apollo, 53

 Quasimodo, Salvatore, 583
 Quevedo, Francisco de, 581
 Quintilian on characterization, 235

 Racan, Honorat de, 571–2
 Radinger, Karl, 23
 rare words, 166, 172–4, 176; 391–408;
 see also hapax legomenon
 Raubitschek, A., 69
 reader response theory, 188–9, 363
 reader, 187–210, 224; interplay of with
 author, 187–8, 202; voice of, 41, 136,
 203; as actor, 204; expectations of,
 187, 225; co-opted into performance,
 37–8; acts of, 40; role of, 168–9, 174;
 presence of, 45; *Leerstellen* and, 209;
 critical, 189; impatience of, 204;
 fictive, 191, 194–5, 205; implied, 191,
 209; intended, 191; *see also* audience,
 reading
 reading, act of, 187–9; aloud, 192;
 while viewing, 29, 33, 35, 38, 46;
 analogy with viewing, 190, 194–5; as
 a behavior, 187–9, 205, 210;
 as a metaphor, 205; experience of,
 187, 205, 210; Hellenistic culture
 of, 187; of characters/signs, 190,
 194–5, 207–8; of portraits/pictures/
 images, 196–7, 203, 208–10; public,
 187, 201, 209; *see also* reception,
 viewing
 realism, psychological, 203
 reception, 29–47, 188; dramatization
 of ideal, 191; Hellenistic culture of,
 207; interiorization of, 195; *see also*
 audience, effects/efficacy, emotional
 heightening, performance, reader,
 reading, response, viewer, viewing
 recipient, *see* reader, viewer, act of
 reading
 recontextualization, 76
 (re)enactment (of ritual, performance),
 35–8, 40, 46; *see also* effects/efficacy,
 emotional heightening, framing,
 performance, response, symposium,
 threnody
 refinement, 178; metrical, 182
 Reitzenstein, Richard, 6, 14, 68, 95
 repetition (διλογία), 319, 322
res gestae, *see facta*
 response, of readers and viewers, 29,
 33, 38–42, 44–7; *see also* effects/
 efficacy, emotional heightening,
 reading, reception
 revival, of early Hellenistic epigram in
 Rome, 533–5
 Rexroth, Kenneth, 583
Rezeptionsästhetik, 188
 Rhadamanthus, 76
 Rhianus, 152, 167, 327–8; dates, 147
 Rhinthon, 477 n. 2
 riddles, 114, 117–8, 194–6, 205,
 260–2
 ritualization, 42, 47 n. 68
 Robertello, Francesco, 567
 Roman emperors, 292–4; as
 epigrammatists, 543–4, 550–4; in
 epigram, 550–1
 Rome, 277, 278 n. 10, 292–4, 420–2;
 see also epigram, Roman
 Ronsard, Pierre de, 576, 580–1

- Rufinus, 175, 201; dates, 553
 Russia, influence of Greek epigram in, 582; *see also* Batiushkov, Konstantin Nikolaevich; Pushkin, Aleksandr Sergeyevich
 Rutilius Rufus, P., 532
- Sabinus, dates, 160; friend of Ovid, 161
 Sainte-Beuve, Charles-Augustin, 574
 Saint-Gelais, Mellin de, 580
 Samius, 152; dates, 147; relationship of with Macedonian court, 153
 sanctuaries, inscriptions at, 2
 Sappho, 147, 152, 211–2, 214, 227, 375, 433, 438–42, 446–7, 478 n. 3; as model for Nossis, 226; epigrams on, 171; Alexandrian edition of, 447; cultural memory of, 452; emulation of, 449; poems of, 446; sensory imagery of, 448; and preneoteric epigram, 534, 536; and Catullus, 536; influence of on Erinna, 213, 226–7; influence of on Nossis, 226–9; performance of at symposia, 212
 Sartre, Jean-Paul, 188, 205
 satiric epigram, 161, 163; Roman, 538
 satyr drama, history of, 488–93
 Saumaise, Claude de, 565
 Scaevola, dates, 160
 Scaliger, Joseph, 566
 Scaliger, Julius Caesar, 567–8, 570, 577
 Scève, Maurice, 568
 school, 429, 430, 434, 441; recitations of selections from classical drama, 483
 schoolmasters, 172; dedications by, 238–9
 Scopadae, 285 n. 34
 Scotland, influence of Greek epigram in, 579; *see also* Buchanan, George
 sculpture, 78, 253, 278 n. 13, 281–3, 286–7, 291; of lion, 90–1; subscriptions to, 459; *see also* epigram, ephrastic; P.Mil.Vogl, VIII 309, *Andriantopoiika*
 Sebillot, Thomas, 569
 self-consciousness, 213, 225; *see also* Hellenistic poets
 self-reflection, 203, 205; *see also* act of thinking; interiorization
 Semonides, 96, 98
 sepulchral epigram, *see* epigram, sepulchral
 serpent-column, 53
 seven wise men, 506; *see also* Pittacus
 Sextus Empiricus, 505
 Shakespeare, William, 568, 579–80
 Shelley, Percy Bysshe, 582
 Sidney, Philip, 568
 Simias of Rhodes, 131, 152, 392–6, 407, 477 n. 2 481–2; dates, 147
 Simonides, 8, 24, 51–5, 60, 64–6, 108, 110–1, 113–30, 147, 152, 285 n. 34, 375; epigrams ascribed to, 453; *see also* *Sylloge Simonidea*
 siren, 62, 218–23; in the *Odyssey*, 219–20; in *parthenia*, 220–1
 skeptics and skepticism, 502–3, 507–8; 512; *see also* Pyrrho of Elis, Timon of Phlius
skolion, 96
 skoptic epigram, 179; definition of, 353–6; and *AP* 11, 353–61; and Martial, 354–5; as decline, 354–5; prior to Philip, 356–61; models for, 356–61; and symposium, 357; term not attested in Hellenistic period for epigram, 360; character types in, 364–5; at symposia, 365; by Philip, 365–8; by Lucilius, 367–8
Smyrneis, 110
 social negotiation, 34, 38, 46; *see also* effects/efficacy
 Socrates, 60–4, 82, 96, 98, 102, 499, 516
 sonnet, 569
sophia, sophos, 197, 208
 Sophocles, 459, 477 n. 2, 481–2, 488–93
sophrosyne, 214–6
Soros, 133
 Sositheus, 490–3; *Daphnis or Lityerses*, 493 n. 32
 Sostratus of Cnidos, 278, 281 n. 20, 285
 Soter, Joannes, 565
 Spain, influence of Greek epigram in, 571, 581; *see also* Gracián, Baltazar; León, Luis de; Lope de Vega; Quevedo, Francisco de
 Spartans, 53
 speaker, in inscribed epigram, 72; first person (epigrammatic “I”), 297, 304, 308, 309–11; perspective of, 72, 84; as exegete, 253, 257, 259; mythical character as, 423–5
 speaking object, 192–9, 209; *see also* monument, voice

- speech act, oral, 191, 198, 202, 209;
 unity of, 191
- sphinx, 62
- Statius, 165
- statues, *see* sculpture
- Stehle, Eva, 214–5
- Stephanos*, meaning of term, 153; *see also*
Garland of Meleager, *Garland of Philip*
- Stesichorus, 429–31; 433, 435 n. 20
- Stobaeus, 65
- Stoics and Stoicism, 502, 509; *see also*
 Zeno of Citium
- Strabo, 161
- Strato, 179, 359
- style, 169–79; grand, 170–1; baroque,
 174; elaborate, 177; mannerism,
 175–9; Leonidean, 178;
 Callimachean, 178, 181; epic, 178,
 affected, 176; plain, 165–9
- subjectivity, *see* focalization
- Suetonius, 551–2
- suicide, 80–2
- supplementation, 50, 56, 62, 169, 177,
 188, 209; *see also* *Ergänzungsspiel*
- Svenbro, Jesper, 32
- sylloge minor*, 120
- Sylloge Simonidea*, 66, 113–30; origin of
 title, 114
- Symmachus of Pellana, 4–5, 116 n. 13
- Symonds, John Addington, 574
- symposium, 13–4, 35–6, 38, 42,
 95–7, 497; Epicurean, 514–5; Plato's
Symposium, 497, 499; rejection of,
 515–7; use of skoptic epigram at,
 365; *see also* epigram, sympotic
- sympotic epigram, *see* epigram, sympotic
- sympotic themes, in Roman epigram,
 534; *see also* epigram, sympotic
- Tarsus (ταρσός), 306
- Tasso, Torquato, 570
- Terentia, epigram of, at Memnon,
 558–60
- Thallus, 160 n. 35–6, 161
- Theaetetus, 171, 484–5
- thematization, 34–5, 38–40, 44, 46;
see also, performance, traditional
 referentiality
- Theocritus, 134, 148, 179, 275–6, 287,
 290–1, 388, 453, 461, 466, 477–8
 n. 2, 500; use of philosophy in,
 512; poem of on statue of Priapus,
 171–2; metrics, 181; epigrams of,
 346; arrangement of epigrams in,
 346; genuineness of epigrams of,
 346–7; bucolic poems and world
 of, 334–5, 338, 349–51; ecphrastic
 epigram of, 263–5; Doric dialect in,
 264
- Theodoridas, 148, 153, 167; dates, 147
- Theognidea*, 116; Books One and “Two,”
 98–106, 110–1
- Theognis, 65, 97–9, 100–2, 105, 108,
 110, 118, 386–7; and Catullus, 535–7
- Theoi Adelphoi*, 278
- Thermopylae, 56, 123; memorial for,
 51; series of epigrams on, 56–7, 64,
 122
- Thespis, 487, 490
- threnody, 38, 40
- Thucydides, 53–5; 121, 124; and
 epigrams, 53; and his sources, 54;
 and ancient authors, 55; use of
 inscriptions in, 121
- thyme, Attic, as metaphor for Attic
 tradition, 494
- Thyrsis, 349
- Tiberius, 159
- Tibullus, 92, 330
- Tiburtinus, epigrams, 535, 540
- Timomachus, painting of Medea by,
 244
- Timon of Phlius, 501–4, 507–8, 512,
 517; *Silloi* 501–4; misanthrope, 470
- Tolomei, Claudio, 580
- tombstone, 71, 91; *see also* epitaph,
Epitymbia, monument, epigram,
 sepulchral
- tourists, female, 543, 545, 555–60
- traditional referentiality, 30, 34, 46;
see also performance, thematization
- tragedy, history of, 487–93
- Trajan, 545; epigram by, 550–3
- trans-gendered voice, 213
- translations of Greek epigram into
 English, 581, 582–3 (*see also* Cowper,
 William; Fitts, Dudley; Harrison,
 Tony; Kendall, Timothy; Prior,
 Matthew; Rexroth, Kenneth; Shelley,
 Percy Bysshe; Turberville, George;
 Whigham, Peter; Wyatt, Thomas);
 into French, 574 (*see also* Baif,
 Jean-Antoine de; Du Bellay, Joachim;
 Décheque, Frédéric; Ronsard, Pierre
 de); into German, 581, 582 (*see also*
 Herder, Johann Gottfried; Opitz,
 Martin); into Italian, 583; into
 Latin, 566; into neo-Latin, 575–9

- (*see also* Alciato, Andrea; Angeriano, Girolamo; Baif, Jean-Antoine de; Bourbon, Nicolas; Buchanan, George; Costanzi, Antonio; Dorat, Jean; Erasmus, Desiderius; Estienne, Henri; Gray, Thomas; Grotius, Hugo; Janus Secundus; Johnson, Samuel; Lily, William; Marullo, Michele; Melanchthon, Philip; More, Thomas; Navagero, Andrea; Pannonius, Janus; Poliziano, Angelo; Scaliger, Joseph); into Russian, 582 (*see also* Batiushkov, Konstantin Nikolaevich); into Spanish, 581
- triumphalia carmina*, 538
- trochaic tetrameter, 96; *see also* metrics
- Troilus, 296
- Trojan horse, 417–8
- Trojan War, 59, 409–28
- Tropoi*, *see* characterization; P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309
- Tullius, dates, 160
- Turberville, George, 581
- Tydeus, 144
- Tymnes, 152
- Tyndarids, 308
- tyrants, 275 n. 2, 285
- Tyrtaeus, 98, 104
- Unbestimmtheitsstelle*, 209
- United States, influence of Greek epigram in; *see* Fitts, Dudley; Pound, Ezra; Rexroth, Kenneth
- upper classes, 343–5; *see also* nobility
- utilitas*, 139–41
- Valerius Aedituus, 531, 534, 535, 536
- variatio*, 73, 136, 139, 172, 176, 335–6, 339–40, 342, 359, 390, 451, 456; and ecphrastic epigram, 263; self-variation as mode of, 338; *see also aemulatio, imitatio*, ποιικιλόμυθος
- ventriloquism, 213, 220
- verisimilitude, 255
- viewer, 189–90, 194–5, 208–9; and reader, 253; inquisitive nature of, 261–2; *see also* reader
- viewing, 190, 269; as analogous to reading, 190; *see also* reading
- Virgil, 138–9, 549–50
- vocabulary, 171–4; technical, 172–3; adjectives, 174; neologisms, 182; complexity of, 171–3, 176
- voice, 32, 38, 40–1, 45 n. 61, 77, 168, 202–3, 208, 215, 221–2, 225; in Anacreon, 456; female, as dangerous, 212, 220; impersonation of female, 212–3, 216; transgendered, 213, 221, 231; male, 226, 230; and voicelessness in ecphrastic epigram, 261–71; as quality of painting, 256; as quality of sculpture, 268; *see also* reader, gendered voice
- Voltaire, 572
- votive epigram, *see* epigram, dedicatory
- Walsh, George, 210, 325–6
- weaving, 216
- Weber, Leo, 62
- West, Martin, 216
- Whigham, Peter, 136.
- Wilson, John (“Christopher North”), 574
- wine, celebration of in Anacreon, 456
- Wirkungsstruktur*, 191, 208
- wit, *see argutia*
- word order, 170, 300–1; and syntax, 44–5
- writing, act of, 197–9; media of, 254, 257
- Wyatt, Thomas, 581
- Xanthippe, 516
- Xenophanes, 97, 105, 108
- Zeno of Citium, 509
- Zeno of Sidon, 512
- Zenodotus of Ephesus, 131, 392, 398, 406–7
- Zephyritis, *see* Arsinoe Zephyritis
- Zephyrium, 25
- zetema*, 205
- Zeus Soter, 278 n. 13, 281 n. 20, 282, 283 n. 28
- Zonas, 160–1; dates, 160

Greek Words

- ἄγαλμα, 42–7
- ἄγραυλος, 394, 395
- ἄκρον, 74–5
- ἄνθεα, 140
- ἄσιλλα, 125
- ἀγρότα, 395

- ἀγωγαῖος, 173
 ἀγώνυξ, 173
 Ἀλήιος γῆ, 398
 ἌΛΛΟ, 132
 ἀναθεματικά, *see* *Anathematika* and
 epigram, dedicatory
 ἀνούατος, 172
 ἀοιδός, 275, 285
 ἀπάτη, 266
 ἀποβρίζω, 405
 ἀρτιγλυφής, 172
 ἀσκήλης, 401
 ἀστερόεις, 399
 ἀταλάν, 223–4, 255; *see also* delicate
 hands
 αὐτόφλοιος, 172

 βέβλημαι, 406–7
 βεβλημένος/βεβοληένος, 397
 Βήριςος, 398
 βραχυσυλλαβία, *see* brevity,
 Callimachus and the ideal of
 brevity

 γαυλός, 173
 γλαγόεις, 172
 γλαγόπηξ, 173
 γλύμμα, 400
 γράμμα, 197; 224–5; ambiguity of,
 255–6; *see also* act of writing
 γραμμάτων συνθέσεις, 224
 γράφειν, 197, 225; in ecphrastic
 epigram, 257; *see also* author and
 writer
 γρίφος, *see* riddle
 γυρός, 403

 διλογία, 319, 322
 δρίος, 395

 ἐκλογή, 114
 ἐλεγείον, in Thucydides, 55
 ἔλιξ, 394
 ἐνάργεια, 252, 319
 ἐπίγραμμα, *see* epigram/*epigramma*
 ἐπιγραμματοποιός, 14
 ἐπιγράφειν, commission an epigram,
 122–3
 ἐπιτομή, 114
 ἔρως, 97–9, 101, 104–5
 ἔρωτικά, 108–9, 11
 εὐμαθίη, 481–2
 εὐστόρθυγξ, 173

 ἡθοποιία, 234–5; *see also*
 characterization
 ἡσύχιος, 406

 θυρεός, 403–404

 ἴξαλος, 394
 ἱππόμαχος, 398
 ἴχνια, 407 n. 54

 καταμήσω, 398
 κελάδων, 401–402
 κερδαλέος, 400
 κρήγυνον, 396
 κυνάγχη, 173

 λᾶας, 403–4
 λαμποπέδη, 173
 λόγος, 60–1

 μνήμα, 31, 74, 217
 Μουσέων λάτρεις, 216
 μουσοποιός, 65–6
 μωρολογία, 534

 νεῦρον, 394

 οἰονοσκοπικά, *see* *Oionoskopika*
 ὀλιγοστιχή, 177
 ὀλοφύρομαι, 30–1, 38, 40
 ὀλοίτροχος, 403
 ὄναρ/ὄνειαρ, 483

 παίγνιον, 117–8, 168, 494
 παῖς, 98, 102
 περισσός, 177
 πίναξ, 254, 257
 πλάττειν, 266, 268
 ποικιλία, *see* *variatio*
 ποικιλόμυθος, 172
 πόνος, 189, 202

 ραιβόκρανος, 173
 ρίνα, 550, 552

 σελῖς, 171
 σῆμα, 71, 217
 σοφία, 255; *see also* *sophia*, *sophos*
 σποδίη, 405–6
 στίβη, 406
 συλλογή, 113–4; *see also* *sylloge minor*,
 Sylloge Simonidea
 συνέριθος, 405

- ταρσός, 306
τέχνη, 61, 64, 267
τίς, 87, 193, 202–3
τόδε, 63; *see also* deictics, deixis
τρόποι and characterization, 235, 241;
 see also P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309
φαληριόωντα, 402
χαίρω/χάρις, 43, 45, 193
χαροπός, 396
χάσκειν, 482–3
χιμαιροβάτης, 173
χρηστός, 531
ψευδος, 266, 268